CATHOLIC EDUCATION: DISTINCTIVE *AND* INCLUSIVE

JOHN WILLIAM SULLIVAN

Thesis submitted to the University of London
for the Degree of PhD
Institute of Education

1998

Catholic Education : Distinctive *and* Inclusive

ABSTRACT

The thesis examines the coherence of the claim that Catholic education is both distinctive and inclusive. It clarifies the implications for church schools of a Catholic worldview and situates Catholic schools in the context of (and subjects them to scrutiny in the light of) alternative liberal philosophical perspectives in our society.

Central questions explored are: what is the nature of, foundation for and implications of the claim that Catholic schools offer a distinctive approach to education? To what extent does the claim to distinctiveness entail exclusiveness or allow for inclusiveness? How far can distinctiveness and inclusiveness (in the context of Catholic education) be reconciled?

An extended commentary on key Roman documents about Catholic education is provided. This is related to the particular context of Catholic schools in England and Wales, where an ambivalence in the purposes of Catholic schools is indicated and a way for them to avoid the ambivalence by being both distinctive and inclusive is suggested.

The study works at the interface between Christian (and more specifically Catholic) theology, philosophical analysis and educational theory and practice with regard to the *raison d'etre* of Catholic schools. Through a retrieval and application of the notion of 'living tradition' it is shown that within Catholicism there are intellectual resources which enable Catholic schools to combine distinctiveness with inclusiveness, although there will be limits on the degree of inclusiveness possible. In the face of criticisms of their potentially inward-looking role in a pluralist society, it is argued that Catholic schools contribute to the common good.

The argument should enhance clarity about purpose for Catholic educators in England and Wales. It also has implications for Catholic schools elsewhere and for other Christians and for people of other religions in the practice of their own forms of faith-based education.

Acknowledgements

My first close encounter with dedicated, painstaking scholarship was in the special subject history class of Dr John Watt (Church and State in the Age of Dante) at Hull University (1969-70). His gentle and humble teaching gave me an initial and enduring enthusiasm for further study and a desire to research the implications of central religious ideas for the wider community and for institutional life. He would have been surprised, but I hope not unhappy about, some of the fruits of his labour and the evidence of his example as shown in my attempt to combine critical appreciation and creative appropriation of the Catholic tradition in exploring a problematical relationship between apparently conflicting emphases within it and the practical implications of these, even though the century, geographical location and particular social activity studied here are quite different from his own specialist areas of interest. This thesis is dedicated to him in grateful memory of his example and inspiration.

Dr Patrick Sherry guided me through a research thesis (M.Litt) at Lancaster University. I learnt a great deal from him, not only from his broad and deep knowledge (lightly held) about philosophy and theology, but also about disciplined study and the craft of writing.

Dr Kevin Williams, Dr Bernadette O'Keeffe and Julie Clague commented on early drafts of different chapters with penetration and insight. I benefited much from their suggestions.

I am grateful to St Mary's University College for their support, both financial and institutional, which enabled this project to be carried out. Thanks are also due to all those teachers whose engagement with me in inservice activities over the last four years has provided a testing ground for some of the ideas explored here. Any nuances which can be detected in my treatment of key notions owe much to the probing questions and challenging observations made by teachers, the quality of whose work - so often unrecognized - I have been privileged to witness.

Dr Priscilla Chadwick, as my initial supervisor, offered constructive criticism and support throughout the early stages of this thesis. Her detailed knowledge of church-state relationships in the sphere of education, her familiarity with the burdens and possibilities of school leadership and the depth of the scholarship underpinning her ecumenical Christian commitment have helped me to be aware of - and I hope to have avoided - at least some possible defects, oversights, and imbalances.

Throughout the whole period of study for this thesis Dr Terry McLaughlin has volunteered generous, detailed, constructive and pertinent advice. This has been a great boost to morale as well as exerting a beneficial influence on the development of the thesis. He has provided a model of how to combine clarity and penetrative depth in critical analysis in the teasing out of relevant issues: I am still striving to move a little nearer the standard he exemplifies.

My principal intellectual debts are owed to Dr Paddy Walsh and Professor Denis Lawton, my supervisors throughout the middle and final stages of the work. They have provided constant encouragement at the same time as they have challenged me to clarify the nature, scope and implications of the study. Our intellectual sparring, whether we reached agreement or agreed to differ, together with their helpful comments on various versions of the text, always cast light on the issues at stake, the concepts under scrutiny and deficiencies in my argument. There would have been many more of the last of these without their guidance. I have been enormously enriched by, and I have greatly enjoyed the benefit of, the breadth of their expertise, the shrewdness of their comments and the kindness of their approach.

Contents

CHAPTER ONE

Distinctiveness and Inclusiveness: incompatibility or creative tension?

This thesis is about Catholic education. In particular, its focus is Catholic schooling in the public sector in late twentieth century England and Wales. This means that I omit treatment of those contexts other than schooling which also provide opportunities for educating Catholics in their faith.[1] The crucial roles of the family and the parish in Catholic education are not addressed. I concentrate my attention on 'ordered learning' in formal educational settings, rather than the Catholic community's total range of processes for education and formation in faith, without assuming that my area of focus is either the most important or the most effective element within those processes.[2] Such ordered learning is central to, but smaller in scope than, the faith community's total formative process.

More particularly still, in focusing on Catholic schooling I do not explore whether the Church should have alternative strategies for carrying out its educational mission nor whether current structures are the most appropriate ones for this purpose. The study *is* intended to be normative for Catholic education, but not in either of these ways, nor in terms of particular details of content; instead its prescriptiveness relates to the principles which should govern, guide and permeate Catholic schooling as a whole.

Among these principles an insufficiently acknowledged ambivalence is identified, one which is of major significance for the practice of Catholic education in the school context. In addressing this ambivalence, I draw upon historical studies of Catholic schooling in England and Wales, engage with recent philosophical analysis of educational issues and concepts which are relevant to the main question being posed

here and examine the theoretical 'story' of Catholic education in the light of its potential internal contradictions, its practical implications and in the face of some criticisms which have been levelled against it. My aim is to articulate the tension between two particular, apparently contrasting, imperatives within Catholic education and then to suggest a way to reduce, if not entirely to resolve, the tension between them.

As part of this process, I also refer to theological developments within Catholicism and that for two reasons : first, because they constitute one of the factors influencing the changing context in which Catholic education is set and second, because they cast light on the foundational principles which govern Catholic education. It is beyond my scope to seek to *justify* these theological elements; my task is rather to establish the *bearing* they have on Catholic education. I do not seek to be comprehensive in my treatment of Catholic theology; I restrict myself to those elements which are relevant to the framing, and, I hope, at least to the partial resolution, of the central issue at stake in this thesis - the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education.

Catholic schools, funded jointly by the church and the state, represent approximately 10% of the total number of maintained schools in England and Wales.[3] Despite their current healthy attendance figures, popularity with parents and record of securing a very high incidence of positive inspection reports,[4] I believe that Catholic schools may well be weakened, both in the effective implementation of their mission and in their self-advocacy, by a failure to acknowledge and to resolve an internal ambivalence in their philosophy and purposes. This leads to confusion about the goals of Catholic schools and to lack of clarity when dealing with criticisms of them.[5]

The worldview underpinning Catholic education in England and Wales and the key concepts which mark out its central features are drawn from a Catholic community which is universal, as well as from local interpretations, internal to this country. Therefore I draw upon relevant Catholic educational literature from elsewhere if it is intended to influence practice here (for instance, authoritative documents from Rome) or if it casts light on the issues being explored in this study. Many of the issues I wrestle with in my reflexive interpretation of a Catholic philosophy of education have to be faced by Catholic schools in other countries, as well as by other faith communities in the United Kingdom. Because of this, I believe that my thesis has implications for Catholics not only in this country but elsewhere. It should also be relevant to other faith communities who have (or who intend to set up) their own schools in this country. In addition, it may be of interest to local and national government officers whose work includes negotiating with church schools.

In this chapter four steps are taken. First, two imperatives in Catholic education, to be distinctive and to be inclusive, are brought into focus and the problematical nature of their relationship is indicated. Second, a feature of the educational scene external to Catholicism is described and it is suggested that this feature both highlights and compounds the unresolved tension between distinctiveness and inclusiveness within Catholic schools. This feature I call 'managerialism'. As part of my critique of managerialism, I emphasize the central importance for education of some overarching 'story', which gives it a sense of direction and guiding values. Third, in building on the Catholic 'story,' I signal my employment later in the thesis of the notion of 'living tradition' as a possible way of resolving the tension between distinctiveness and inclusiveness. Fourth, two contrasting responses to the current condition of Catholic education are considered in order to clarify further the parameters of the problem being addressed and the stand-point being adopted here. Each response, in different

ways, highlights the need for greater clarity about both distinctiveness and inclusiveness and a better understanding of how these two imperatives are interconnected.

1.1 Two imperatives

What is the central problem to be addressed here? It arises from two apparently conflicting imperatives within Catholicism. On the one hand, the mission of the Church is to transmit something distinctive, a divinely sanctioned message for life (and eternal life). This imperative has overtones of the prophetic stance, of transcendence, of teaching with authority, of conveying truth in its comprehensiveness and without compromise. It suggests the notions of boundaries to be protected and of 'wine' to be preserved. The value of the 'currency' of Catholic doctrine is to be guarded by vigilant oversight of all 'issues' or pronouncements on behalf of the Church. This is to ensure that justice is done to the message to be conveyed. The purity and efficacy of the 'medicine' of salvation available through the Church needs to be relied upon by whoever avails themselves of it. Strong border controls and customs stations are to be maintained to prevent contamination from alien ideas which might be corrosive of truth and to assess carefully 'foreign imports' for their likely 'impact' on the 'economy' of the faith and the lives of the faithful.

On the other hand, an equally important imperative for Catholicism is to be fully inclusive, to be open to all types of people and to all sources of truth. The gospel to be offered is not only to be addressed *to* all people, which might simply require an unwavering and consistent effort to proclaim the message; it is also - and this is crucial for this thesis - *for* all people and must take into account their differing situations and

experiences, their insights and perplexities, their challenges and needs, their hopes and fears. The salvific power of the message to be conveyed depends not only on its authoritative source, its accurate and comprehensive transmission, and due respect for its distinctive nature, but also on its capacity to embrace the concerns, to meet the needs and to address the perspectives of all God's people, in a way that is open to and inclusive of the diversity of their circumstances and cultures.

This second imperative has resonances of pastoral care, of immanence, of learning by listening, of receptiveness and accommodation, of flexibility in the face of historical and cultural change and of vulnerability.[6] It seeks to avoid a fearful isolation from others and to encourage a full-hearted collaboration with them wherever possible and an involvement in the world rather than a retreat from it. This aspect of Catholicism acknowledges its own shortcomings, mistakes and sinfulness, its pilgrim status of still being 'on the way' and therefore its incompleteness, and, in parallel with this, it seeks to be attentive to the workings of the Holy Spirit beyond its 'borders'. As a result, it embraces liturgical variety, welcomes cultural pluralism, seeks harmony between different perspectives, recognizes the spiritual truths and values inherent in other Christians and in other religions and encourages free and constructive dialogue with people of other persuasions. If these goods are to be secured, it might be argued, from this inclusive aspect of Catholicism, that defenders of distinctiveness and guardians of orthodoxy must allow easy access to and for 'outsiders' and should seek neither to inhibit the exchange of ideas and experiences, nor to obstruct joint endeavours between Catholics and others.

These two imperatives do not sit easily together. The differing ways they coexist and interpenetrate one another and are expressed in the precepts and policies of Catholic educators have great significance for Catholics and for others in our society. The

degree of success with which they are held in balance will influence the acceptability of Catholic schools in a plural, mainly non-religious society. This balance is not easy to maintain. At times one imperative may appear to dominate Catholic educational thinking and practice, to the detriment of the other.

Where distinctiveness is emphasised, the integrity of faith is at stake. Catholic schools must endeavour to pass on the fullness of the faith. An undue willingness to be inclusive in the sense of accommodating the perspectives and priorities of those who cannot accept the message in its entirety might lead to a distortion of truth and a fateful damaging of the salvation prospects of those pupils who have been included but misled. Where inclusiveness is stressed, the welcoming nature of faith is at issue. In Catholic schools the particular (and diverse) academic, social, spiritual and other needs of pupils are to be addressed, regardless of their relationship to Catholicism. If too strong a priority is given to defending the distinctiveness of Catholicism, (and following from this, the distinctiveness of Catholic education,) there is a danger of exhibiting undesirable features, such as exclusiveness, rigidity, closed mindedness, intolerance, excessive confidence that truth is already fully possessed, and therefore of displaying an unwillingness to learn from others.

The two imperatives should be seen as complementary rather than in contradiction to one another.[7] Instead of considering inclusiveness as something to be set against distinctiveness within Catholic education, one might claim that two kinds of distinctiveness are to be (simultaneously) of concern. The first is the distinctiveness of the Catholic tradition, which is to be maintained and communicated. The second is the distinctiveness (in the sense of the uniqueness and incommunicability) of each person (pupils, their families and staff) who comes into contact with Catholic schools. This second aspect of distinctiveness, being sensitive to the particularity of each

person and being willing to welcome them and learn from them, should receive a high priority in Catholic education, not only because of respect for human dignity, but also because, in terms of their own theology, Catholics acknowledge God's presence *in* their pupils.[8] This way of considering the two imperatives only relocates the problematical nature of their relationship; it does not dissolve it. I shall therefore continue to refer to the polarity in the terms 'distinctive' and 'inclusive'.

Furthermore, from the point of view of the teaching act, communication and receptivity, like distinctiveness and inclusiveness, are correlative terms: one implies the other. We can distinguish, logically, if not chronologically, two phases in this correlation. First, as a teacher, my communication requires not only clarity about something distinctive and particular on my part, but also a receptivity from others, an openness on the part of my pupils. This is one aspect of their correlation. But, second, if my communication is to be effective, I must be receptive to their situation and perceptions and I must attend to their communication with me. In the context of Catholic education, no awareness of distinctiveness is possible without awareness of difference, and no possibility of inclusiveness remains without there being a distinct body (of people and truth) to which one can belong and by which one can be included.

Although the problematic nature of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness arises internally, from within Catholicism, issues external to that faith exert considerable influence on the unstable tension between these imperatives. These issues provide part of the context for this work. They challenge Catholic education with a new and particularly sharp voice. But they also reveal in an interesting way that there are resources for education from within the Catholic 'story' which may be relevant to others.

1.2. The managerial imperative

In what follows I describe a problem which I believe is widespread in education and then suggest that it has particular relevance to my attempt here to resolve the tensions within Catholic education already indicated. In my work as an educational management consultant I have come to recognise more and more keenly the defects of 'managerialism' and the dangers posed for schools by too ready an adoption of the managerial imperative. What are these defects? Much of the managerial literature aimed at improving educational practice seems to display a universalism which is blind to cultural differences, curriculum specialisms, the climate of particular communities and the role of traditions as foundations for identity and our outlook on the world.[9] Such standardisation diminishes education, rather than enhances it.[10] Atomistic objectives and competencies are described without reference to the perspectives and passions of the people involved.[11] A false sense of certainty and the dangerous illusion of control is hinted at as the desired outcomes if the relevant competencies are developed. In reality, there are so many variables involved in education that, no matter how confident a teacher is in employing a range of techniques, she can never claim predictive powers with regard to their effects with any particular group of pupils. This would not allow for a free response on their part. The ambiguity, complexity, particularity, creativity, unpredictability, open-endedness and essentially personal dimensions of educational practice can soon be lost sight of when too strong an emphasis is laid on 'managing' education.[12] In the industrial model of school, alongside line management and total quality control,

> budgets are kept and scrutinised by accountants, press officers try to ensure a positive public image, and performance indicators are put in place to monitor output variables. Above all, there is concern that the product, that is the student, should be delivered

> effectively and efficiently in accordance with the requirements of the various customers, for example, employers, government, further and higher education.[13]

This is not to reject the important part that sound management can play in education. Pupils and teachers can benefit enormously from effective management and they suffer greatly in its absence. Many of the skills outlined in educational management literature, if sensitively employed with intelligent attention to context and to purpose, do enhance the quality of learning and assist in harnessing the talents of each for the good of all. But too great a readiness to map out performance indicators, programmes of study, attainment targets, development plans, and the scaffolding of competencies required at various stages throughout the teaching profession[14] can lead to specifications which are too elaborate, leave too little to chance, reduce the possibility of appropriate reciprocity and interaction between teachers and learners and slip too easily into conceiving of education as a technique requiring merely one-way transmission.[15] The outcomes of educational exchanges are essentially unpredictable and unamenable to control, even at the same time as teachers intend them to be purposeful, orderly and carefully structured.[16]

One of the features of the managerial movement within education is an emphasis on accountability, which requires continuous monitoring and regular evaluation. These practices are likely to become much attenuated if they are part of a managerialism which is insufficiently informed by a carefully thought through educational philosophy and ethic, (which includes, for example, a view of the human person, society, well-being, education and relationships). Lacking such a foundation, the practice of monitoring can very easily slip into increased surveillance for increased compliance and evaluation can be reduced to counting what is easily measurable. The attempt to increase control through the practices (and associated external agencies) of monitoring

and evaluation is likely to induce fear and resistance on the part of both teachers and students.

Furthermore I think that educators who accept too readily the managerial approach seek to reach certainty about those short - and medium -term outcomes which are amenable to objective measurement. This is to seek certainty at the wrong 'end' of education, for reasons I have given already. It would be better, I believe, to look for certainty at the beginning of our endeavours, to aim for greater clarity about our purposes in education and those beliefs and values which frame the whole process for us.

Two caveats are necessary here. First, I accept that workable 'visions' for education only emerge in the light of a considerable degree of trial and error. I become clearer about what I am trying to do as a result of both successful and unsuccessful practice, in dealing with difficulties and in the midst of encountering misunderstanding and opposition. My emphasis on clarity about purpose rather than outcomes is then more a matter of the degree of priority to be accorded to principles and aims. These are by their nature rather general and elusive. It can be too readily assumed that they are both understood and accepted, leading too swiftly to a concentration on apparently more concrete and measurable behavioural outcomes as indicators of progress. Judgements about pupil achievement, teacher performance, the quality of a course, the effectiveness of a policy or the value added by a school cannot be reached without a proper weighing of the aims and purposes of the people involved, and with regard to these aims and purposes, their grounding, worth and coherence.

Second, I accept that teachers should seek an objective view of the effectiveness of their efforts, the curriculum and the school as a whole, insofar as this is possible.

However, monitoring and evaluation, like other 'tools' of management, should serve, rather than obscure, a larger vision and purpose which is at the heart of the educational endeavour.

From my own observations I would claim that Catholic schools probably suffer as much as other schools from these defects of managerialism. Furthermore, I believe that the potential for managerialism to damage education is strengthened in a context, like that of a church school, which gives high priority to a mission statement and which heavily underlines the legitimacy of authority (divine, scriptural, ecclesial).[17] In such a context it is often too readily presumed, and with insufficient warrant, that certain ideals are shared and a particular code of behaviour accepted.[18] After a Headteacher has been appointed by school governors there can be a temptation to confuse the general mandate to lead with his or her personal vision of Catholic education for this particular school.[19] Sometimes the comment that 'this is a Catholic school' precludes debate and gives the impression that the essence of Catholicism is uncontested by Catholics themselves and that the application of Catholic beliefs to the practice of education is straightforward.

In his analysis of 'mission' in organizations generally, Pattison considers its connotations of higher purposes, of obedience to superiors, of urgency, and of implementation being both inexorable and costly. While the notion has galvanizing power, it is also open to defective interpretations.

> Mission may appear to justify narrowness, imperialism, conquest, and changing others and the world rather than living alongside them. The implicit radical, invasive, sectarian, dualistic overtones of this concept may energize outreach at the expense of seeing people outside the organization as 'objects' to be saved.[20]

If employed in this way, the concept is liable to support a drive for distinctiveness which, in failing to attend to the particular circumstances and needs of individuals, is insufficiently inclusive. Catholic schools, which by their nature are more liable than many to the use of the language of 'mission', need to guard against these dangers.

For a variety of reasons, which are explored later, many teachers who work in Catholic schools do not have a clear view of Catholicism. As a result they lack any distinctive vision of Catholic education. This makes some aspects of school evaluation especially perplexing or even burdensome for them, at the same time as it makes more complex the task of Catholic school management and leadership. All teachers are subject to scrutiny and pressure through appraisal, inspection and league tables based on pupil performance.[21] In Catholic schools they are also inspected by diocesan-approved officers who report on the quality of the school as a Catholic community. This inspection assesses the degree to which the school mission is being implemented, as shown by religious teaching, worship, permeation of Catholicism through the curriculum and school life and community relations. Furthermore, there are additional expectations as regards their own example as teachers.[22] In these circumstances it is not surprising that some teachers in Catholic schools perceive the recent emphasis on monitoring, evaluation and school review as a form of increased surveillance for increased compliance.

Yet, when they are set in a larger context of long-term goals, pervading values and well-founded principles, some of the strategies employed in school management can be freed from the manipulative functions to which they are prone. Neil Postman recently advocated a return to the 'metaphysical' rather than the 'engineering' aspects of education, that is answers to the question 'why?' have priority over 'how?'[23] Postman argues that education flourishes best when it is sustained by an overarching

narrative, a story that "tells of origins and envisions a future, a story that constructs ideals, prescribes rules of conduct, provides a source of authority, and, above all, gives a sense of continuity and purpose."[24] This kind of narrative must have "sufficient credibility, complexity and symbolic power" to enable those who rely on it to organize their lives around it.[25] Such a story will "give point to our labours, exalt our history, elucidate the present, and give direction to our future."[26]

Postman reiterates my concern that education under the sway of managerialism is in danger of seeking to *control* the process of learning, but with no worthy end in view. If schools are to be important sites for education, what goes on there must engage our attention, arouse our interest, capture our energies and direct our efforts. For this to occur, education must serve non-trivial ends and offer a god or gods who call us to give ourselves fully to a larger, worthy purpose. In this process our lives will not be confined or diminished but liberated and enhanced. Those who start the educational journey with ends in mind, can also demonstrate flexibility about routes and allow for detours, backtracking, starting again and changing direction.

Postman's primary aim is not to justify or to demonstrate the coherence of a particular narrative but to emphasise that any enduring educational endeavour needs to draw upon a comprehensive and powerfully illuminating and motivating 'story'.[27] This 'story' will be 'foundational', that is, it will provide key concepts, goals, metaphors and values for the conduct of education, but it is not to be held uncritically, nor is it unrevisable; indeed the best of stories will have the capacity to cope with criticism, revision and constant adaptation to changing circumstances. Neither the basis nor the plausibility of Postman's thesis rest upon religious assumptions.[28] He proposes several stories or myths as frameworks for education (for example, democracy, America, multiculturalism and spaceship earth).[29] Many of them are held much

more lightly than are the key narratives of any particular religion. By comparison with these, Postman's myths make fewer demands and they are more vulnerable to modification and even jettisoning, if they no longer serve their purpose. His proposals are intended to prompt us to relate education to our greatest purposes and priorities in life.

Such a desire is of course not new.[30] Indeed it is a traditional view of both education in particular and of society in general that there is need of "some higher spiritual principle of co-ordination to overcome the conflicts between power and morality, between reason and appetite, between technology and humanity and between self-interest and the common good."[31] But it is a view which has been considered outmoded for some time in mainstream educational thinking. This is due to it being seen as connected too closely with discredited religious world-views, which no longer command allegiance, and also because education is seen as having internal aims, rather than as serving extrinsic purposes.[32] With the failure of the Enlightenment project to deliver all that was expected of it in terms of rationality, autonomy and well-being, and with a re-appraisal of the limits of individualism, the need for community, the foundations of reason and shortcomings of materialism, this traditional view of the centrality of narrative is once again considered worthy of serious attention.[33] While I acknowledge that the diverse forms of postmodern critique which follow the supposed failure of the Enlightenment project call into question the possibility of such narratives, for the purposes of this argument I assume that such critiques can be met.[34]

The term 'narrative' here is being used in a special sense. The focus is less on the chronological ordering of events which make up a 'story' and more on the ordering of lives which can follow from adopting the 'story' as a guide for life, one which

structures our priorities, elicits our energies, sustains our efforts in the face of difficulties and one which encourages us to cooperate with others who share a 'story' that embodies ideals. In this sense the story is normative. It tells us how things *should* be, rather than how they *have* been. Even when the story appears to be based on the past, for example, a divine revelation or a salvific event, its significance for those who adhere to it is its promise for the future.[35] This kind of story is meant to provide us with a vision towards which we can strive.

One of the characteristics of leadership, as distinguished from management, is the presence of such vision and the capacity to inspire others to engage with it. If the possessors of a vision seek to prescribe too closely the details of the route to be taken, rather than to inspire others to make the journey towards the ends held up before them, they slip into managerialism. In seeking such a level of control, they betray a lack of trust in others and in the intrinsic attractiveness of the goal.

1.3 Resolving the tension through living tradition

I have made two main points so far. First, Catholic education needs to resolve the inbuilt tension between the claims to distinctiveness and inclusiveness. Perhaps this is a task which faces each generation, for with any fresh interpretation of her distinctive identity, the church needs a corresponding re-evaluation of what inclusiveness entails.[36] In arriving at this sense of distinctive identity the church has to review, not only her own constituent 'elements' and principles, but also how these differ from and relate to alternative perspectives on offer 'from outside' her own ranks. Therefore, an understanding of inclusiveness is inevitably affected by any modified sense of distinctiveness.[37]

Second, the tension between distinctiveness and inclusiveness is highlighted and compounded by developments outside Catholic education, within what I have called the managerial imperative. In describing this imperative I have noted both negative and positive features, the first to be avoided, namely the danger of seeking excessive control, which squeezes the life from teaching and learning, and the second to be provided more abundantly, namely visionary leadership set in the context of some overarching 'story' or rationale for education.

Managerialism challenges Catholic educators in four ways. First it tempts them to import into schools priorities (for example, concern for their market position and success in narrowly prescribed league tables) and modes of working (for example, enforced compliance and alignment within the school as an organization and 'zero tolerance' of failure) which sit uneasily with, even when they do not directly contradict, key features of Catholic education. Second, by pressurising school leaders to establish ever-increasing levels of control over key aspects of teaching and learning, it further underlines the dangers of a one-sided emphasis on distinctiveness within the context of Catholic education. Without an adequate emphasis on inclusiveness, new control mechanisms in the service of an authoritative, universal and unavoidable mission can become overbearing and pay too little attention to local realities and needs. Third, the lack that I have indicated within managerialism, of an adequate 'story' with which to frame and give purpose to schooling, should prompt Catholic educators to re-present their own account of the nature and purpose of education as an important resource for rectifying the shortcomings of managerialism. Fourth, it might be claimed more generally that managerialism, as a development which faces all schools, brings out more sharply an already existing tension in Catholic education and that an acknowledgement of its defects has implications for how this tension might be addressed.

The way I seek to resolve this tension, both as it arises from within Catholic education and as it is expressed in the context of the managerial imperative, is through a retrieval of the notion of living tradition. Much more will said about this in chapter six. Here I merely sketch out a simplified overview of the relevance of living tradition to the issues already raised.

Liberal education gives a very high priority to the promotion of autonomy and to freeing students from the constraints of ignorance, prejudice and superstition.[38] It seeks to maximise the exercise of liberty by promoting sufficient levels of rationality among the population to enable them to choose their own projects in life. At the same time it seeks to minimize the possibility of any interference (for example, by parents, traditions or authority figures) in the individual's identification and pursuit of the good. A defect of liberal education is that it has neglected the role of tradition in the formation of both personal identity and of the community, so that its teaching of concepts, skills and attitudes is insufficiently embedded in a tradition and inadequately illuminated by a comprehensively developed 'story'. If education is set in the context of a tradition and a 'story' then schools are enabled to function as 'constitutive' communities.[39] The upshot of Postman's argument, outlined above, is that schools need to find an appropriate comprehensive narrative which can direct their work. But a defect in emphasising tradition *per se* is that it can become backward-looking, closed, authoritarian, demanding conformity and cramping creativity. Traditionalists can be so assured of possessing the truth that their communication becomes one-way, concentrating on transmission and neglecting reception.[40] In this way active learning is discouraged and the tradition is no longer living.[41]

A focus on 'living' tradition draws on the strengths of tradition but avoids its limitations by being open to new questions and perspectives, attentive to the needs, insights and potential contributions of people within and beyond the church. To focus on 'living' tradition allows for a two-way transformation in communication: it brings tradition to bear on us so that we hear its challenge to change in the light of its ideals; it also allows the tradition to be transformed by our questions, insights and experiences.[42] A retrieval of living tradition should leave room for both critical solidarity and critical openness. Critical solidarity *with* tradition fosters a sense of belonging, commitment and distinctiveness. Critical openness *from* tradition facilitates openness and inclusiveness. Critical openness can also be reflexively directed back *at* tradition.

But how open can a tradition, such as Catholicism, afford to be, without losing essential features? John Courtney Murray, who might arguably be considered a principal architect of the modern Roman Catholic church's positive response to western democracy,[43] asked a similar question about the 'open society' in 1960:

> how open can it afford to be, and still remain a society; how many barbarians can it tolerate, and still remain civil; how many "idiots" can it include (in the classical Greek sense of the "private person" who does not share in the public thought of the City), and still have a public life; how many idioms, alien to one another, can it admit and still allow the possibility of civil conversation?[44]

Clearly there is within Catholicism a distinctive tradition (vis a vis other Christian denominations) which includes canon law, liturgy, spirituality, ecclesiology, doctrine, morality and sacramentality. History, continuity and authority are emphasised. There also coexist within Catholicism elements of diversity with regard to spirituality, ecclesial organization, inculturation and teaching about the Holy Spirit leading us more fully into truth and breaking through our human barriers and categories.

However, flexibility, accommodation and reinterpretation run the risk of dissolving distinctiveness and identity. How far can the 'external protections' and permissions provided by a liberal society be applied internally (within the church generally and within church schools in particular) without serious loss?[45] As Eamonn Callan points out,

> parents who feel alienated on religious grounds from the public culture of their society may view with something akin to terror the possibility that their children will come to identify with that culture, because in so doing they could no longer share a way of life with their children that is for them a precondition of intimacy....The influences they seek to shield their children from are influences they shun themselves as a threat to the only life worth living.[46]

Equally important, how far (within Catholic education) may internal restrictions (for example, relating to pupil admissions, staff appointments and promotion, curriculum content, or constraints on criticism, debate or behaviour) be imposed in the interests of maintaining a way of life in its integrity without contradicting the very ethos being espoused?[47]

The key question being addressed here is: can Catholic education combine distinctiveness with inclusiveness? And, if it can, what qualifications on this combination might be required to ensure, on the one hand, that its distinctiveness does not harden into exclusiveness or an overbearing prescriptiveness, and, on the other hand, that its inclusiveness and openness do not slip into emptiness or dissolution?[48]

Furthermore, I believe that this key question is being asked at a transitional period in the church's self-understanding. Internal rethinking and external pressures, taken together, prompt the church to review several features of its life : its understanding and exercise of authority, the need for dialogue with 'outsiders', the dangers of

excessive control, the conditions for 'reception' of truth and for internalization of values, the relationship between faith and culture, and the application of moral teaching to its own institutions as well as the relevance of Catholic social teaching for society at large.[49] One might claim that what I have called a transitional moment in the church's self-understanding is equivalent in importance to MacIntyre's notion of an 'epistemological crisis'.[50] In a recent collection of essays on the contemporary Catholic school Paul Hypher brings out something of this transitional moment. "Catholic schools founded with one set of objectives are now being required to adapt to newer objectives relating to openness, dialogue, mission, other faiths, option for the poor, racism and religious freedom, while at the same time remaining true to their original purpose."[51] In the re-thinking required by this transitional moment, it is possible that aspects of the Catholic tradition can be shown to have a relevance beyond that specific faith community, for example, a coherent worldview, strongly articulated moral values, a compelling and realistic vision of integral human development and a powerful sense of community, together with ways of balancing its benefits and burdens.

In order to address the needs arising from this transitional moment, this thesis engages with Christian theology, philosophical analysis and educational policy and practice. It seeks to contribute to living tradition, to develop understanding of the nature and role of Catholic schools in our society, to address some problems arising (for 'insiders' and 'outsiders') from the presence of separate Catholic schools in a pluralist society and to indicate the potential contribution these schools can make both to education and to society. This combination of aims requires some equivalent to Postman's plea for a metanarrative governing education, specifically here for Catholic schools. This metanarrative cannot, without loss of continuity with tradition, be entirely or even substantially new. But, by constantly keeping in mind the tension between

distinctiveness and inclusiveness, I hope to *re-present* the tradition in such a way as to reduce the ambivalence I referred to in section 1.1.

Therefore I provide (in chapters three and four) an account of the Roman Catholic 'story' in relation to education before unpacking some of the implications of this metanarrative for those who work in Catholic schools (in chapters five and six) and for society as a whole (in chapter seven). In doing so I hope I have made some progress in addressing what McLaughlin has identified as "the lack of a coherent modern statement of a Catholic philosophy of education which deprives the Catholic educational community of important resources with which to confront questions of distinctiveness."[52] The thesis also illustrates simultaneously one particular moment in the developing relationship between a substantive faith community (Roman Catholicism) and liberalism, especially in the context of education, and it highlights some aspects of the thinking required for the ongoing task of inculturation faced by that community.[53]

1.4.1 Entering the conversation : between Arthur and Bryk

The nature, purpose and standpoint of this thesis can be clarified further by relating it to two contrasting responses to the condition of Catholic education. These responses are to be found in two substantial recent studies. The first of these is *The Ebbing Tide* by James Arthur.[54] The book focuses on major issues of policy and practice for Roman Catholic education in England and Wales in the period 1960-90. Arthur provides a very clear and helpful historical background to these issues, which include concerns about curriculum, pupil admissions, staffing and control. The context in which Catholic education developed in this country and the goals it has pursued both before and since the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) are set forth in a balanced

and well-argued manner. He gives a detailed outline of government education policies and a lively and penetrating, if somewhat jaundiced, analysis of the response of the Catholic bishops. Rather more controversially, he posits various models of Catholic schooling, which serve to demonstrate to his satisfaction the stages along which Catholic education has been eroded, even betrayed, albeit unintentionally and unwittingly.[55]

Arthur's main points can be summarised as follows. The Catholic bishops have concentrated their energies more on quantitative than qualitative issues regarding Catholic education, that is on the provision of sufficient places rather than on maintaining distinctiveness. (p.2) An inadequate response to government education policies on their part has meant that "it is difficult to implement the 'official' principles of Catholic education". (p.2.)[56] The overlap and distinction in structures (diocesan, religious orders, national) for Catholic education [57] "do not easily lend themselves to long-term decision-making." (p.161.) As a result, the "Catholic voice in education is neither united nor coherent." (p.167.) In the vacuum left by the overall failure of the bishops to address adequately from a Catholic point of view the issues of curriculum, admissions, staffing and control, many Catholic schools "have pursued a line of development which is not in harmony with their founding principles" and they have "lost sight of the Christian principles which support the ideals of Catholic education." (p.225.) Alongside the weakening in practice of Catholic education, there has been a "conspicuous lack of reflection on the goals which underpin the Catholic school system. Educational philosophy, psychology, management, curriculum theory and policy studies have all developed in the mainstream of educational research, to the neglect of the Catholic dimension in education." (p.247.)

A major implication of Arthur's thesis is that, in the integration of faith and culture, which is at the heart of Catholic education, faith has been subordinated to the priorities of a secular culture. This weakening of the Catholic dimension is shown, for example, by inadequate attention to mission statements, by a patchy and unconvincing use of professional development days to address issues of ethos and by a failure to permeate the curriculum with Catholic principles.[58] I believe that this part of Arthur's thesis is accurate, although it would be unjust to accuse all Catholic schools of these shortcomings; many have struggled heroically on one or more of these areas. It is certainly fair to claim that many staff (including many of those who are personally committed to Catholicism) find it very difficult to articulate either a general rationale for Catholic education or any non-superficial presentation of how Catholic principles should inform policies and practices in schools.[59] I explore some of the reasons for this situation in chapter two.

There are four further comments to be made on the argument of *The Ebbing Tide*. First, the criticism of the bishops for their inadequate defence of the qualitative aspects of Catholic education is over-stated. It is true that the structures in place for developing Catholic education policy are somewhat dispersed, thereby hindering concerted effort. But the diversity can also be seen as a strength, if it allows for experimentation on a smaller scale than an all-or-nothing basis among Catholic schools. Too zealous an approach by the bishops to enforce an official line might have been interpreted by teachers as heavy-handed and as displaying both that concern with control outlined earlier as a defect of the managerialist imperative and an accompanying lack of trust.

The reluctance of the bishops to speak out on educational policy issues in the authoritative way desired by Arthur may be due less to any lack of concern on their

part for the health of Catholic education than to a perception of their role as one of encouragement of a flock which was undergoing rapid assimilation into the mainstream of English society. After a period of marked dependence on clerical authority, English Catholics were invited to accept the kind of lay responsibility called for in the documents of the Second Vatican Council. Arthur's criticism of the bishops would be less strong now, given that they and their representative agencies have, in the last few years, issued many guidance documents for Catholic education.[60] Furthermore, within these recent documents, it seems to me that a fine balance has been established between general principle and practical implications, between ideals and reality. The tone set is clear and firm without falling into paternalism or hectoring.

My second response to Arthur's book is simply to record my impression that its vantage point seems somewhat removed from the burdensome and complex realities of office, where compromise is often required if the best that is possible in less than ideal circumstances is to be achieved. Those who adopt the moral high ground and carp at the shortcomings of others may maintain a certain kind of uncontaminated purity, but at the expense of removing themselves from the field of battle and so rendering their remedies inaccessible. It is not clear whether Arthur would have preferred an uncompromising line to have been adhered to, even at the cost of massive closure of Catholic schools. If such a strong approach had been adopted, the defence of the distinctiveness of Catholic education could have been upheld more consistently but perhaps at the cost of displaying an exclusiveness - a religious elitism - that is alien to Catholicism.

My third comment is that Arthur appears, at least on the basis of *The Ebbing Tide*, to confuse faith with *the* faith and church with *the* church. By this I mean that he treats

the external, objective, institutional and hierarchical dimensions of the church as if they include without remainder and must totally dominate the internal, subjective, personal and community dimensions. In practice the relations between these different dimensions are fluid, complex, difficult to pin down and reciprocally interacting. As a result of his approach, Arthur seems uncomfortable with pluralism and desirous of greater uniformity.[61]

My final comment is to accept as valid many of the principal themes which permeate Arthur's argument : there *are* resources within Catholicism for a comprehensive and distinctive vision for education; these resources are *not* well enough known by Catholic teachers; in several respects the Catholic 'story' *will* challenge both government policy and present practices within Catholic schools; Catholic educators *should* hold religion and education together and avoid any separation between them. Arthur is correct in arguing that approaches to education are logically and morally bound to be affected by "the Church's understanding of our nature, truth, sin, grace, revelation and our supernatural end". (p.81.) But when he goes on (p.83.) to assert that "the articulation of the essential, timeless, non-negotiable aspects of Catholic education as compared with the circumstantial, contemporary and adaptable aspects have been neglected by the Catholic community", my acceptance is qualified by two concerns: first, that he seems to yearn for a classical rather than a historical approach to culture,[62] and, second, that he misconceives the complex relationship between culture and faith, assuming too readily that culture is always to be informed and corrected by faith in a one-way movement.[63]

A contrasting response to the condition of Catholic education is illustrated in *Catholic Schools and the Common Good.*[64] This is an authoritative examination of the workings of Catholic high schools in the United States of America. It is very relevant

to secondary schooling on this side of the Atlantic and, indeed, to other parts of the world where there is an attempt to provide education based on religious principles. The book draws on a very substantial sample of evidence: from independent schools[65] and those run by dioceses or parishes; from single sex and co-educational schools; from large, medium and small-sized institutions; from those which have a long history and those which are fairly recent; from those which are all-white, those which are almost all minority and those which are thoroughly integrated racially; from schools which are stable financially and those which are struggling in this respect; from those which are selective academically, socially or religiously and those which are completely non-selective.[66]

Its findings should be of interest to but also perplexing to a number of different groups.[67] First, these findings encourage those who advocate the continuing need for church schools in an increasingly secularised society. Second, they are not, however, completely convincing to those who suspect (perhaps Arthur is an example) that Catholic schools have sold out to secularism, for the distinguishing features of Catholic schools are certainly not described in this work in terms which are recognisable as quintessentially Catholic.[68] Third, these findings challenge those who, whether from within or beyond the church, propose the abandonment of such schools and a move toward a fully integrated, single public educational system. Fourth, they are confusing to those who argue for greater choice and diversity among schools, since while on the one hand they seem to bear out the value of an alternative to a monolithic, single state school system, at the same time they present a powerful critique of many of the values espoused by the choice lobby (in many countries) and promoted through initiatives of the recent Conservative government in the United Kingdom.[69]

The authors describe a cultural change over the last thirty years with regard to the nature, composition and ethos of Catholic schools in the USA. Where they were culturally isolated, doctrinaire and racially segregated,[70] now there is a significantly increased number of ethnic minority and non-Catholic students, increased representation and responsibility for lay staff, a warm and welcoming atmosphere.[71] The typical Catholic school (in the USA) is more internally diverse with regard to race and income than the typical public school. Charges of elitism and exclusivism are outdated and unwarranted. Catholic teachers are now better trained and educated, more likely to have had teaching experience in the public sector and to be more in touch with the rest of contemporary culture.[72] They are far more likely to be lay staff, for the predominance of members of religious orders has ceased, due to massive defections from the priesthood and the various congregations, to new types of deployment among many of those who remain and to a huge reduction in those entering 'religious' vocations. Bryk and his colleagues show that in 1967 there were 94,000 religious staff in Catholic schools, a figure that had fallen to 20,000 by 1990.[73] It has also to be acknowledged that religious orders *led* the change of priority in their ministry to the poor and to the inner city and, in the process, to welcome non Roman Catholic pupils into their schools. It remains to be seen whether or not the Catholic community will maintain the option for the poor within the inner city schools as the numbers of religious declines further.

Key features of such schools include an emphasis on a relatively constrained, academically focused curriculum for all students, "a pervasive sense, shared by teachers and students, of the school as a caring environment,...and an inspirational ideology that directs institutional action toward social justice in an ecumenical and multicultural world."[74] A range of evidence and argument is presented that suggests that this academic emphasis, sense of community and strong value system do

contribute to the effectiveness of Catholic schools. Such schools tend to be smaller than their counterparts in the public system, more frequently single sex and offer a wider range of extra-curriculum experiences. They also expect teachers to extend their role beyond instruction, so they accept a morally educative role and a part in community-building that is developmental personally, socially and spiritually for students.[75] Disruptive behaviour is less frequent, teacher-student tensions are much reduced, levels of engagement with study are higher, (although choices among courses are fewer), the character of instruction is more traditional, (this in terms of format, setting, use of materials and pedagogy), and teacher satisfaction seems higher, despite lower salary levels.[76]

Detailed statistics about both teacher and student outcomes are provided which tell very favourably for Catholic schools. These cover such aspects as high staff morale and effectiveness, low absenteeism and high student interest in work, together with low disruption, truancy and drop-out rates. The authors also confirm Coleman's finding[77] that "students' personal and academic background plays a more substantial role in the public sector in determining subsequent academic experiences"[78] and that Catholic schools promote "higher levels of achievement, especially for disadvantaged students."[79]

Among the main differences claimed for Catholic schools we find an explicit, deliberate and confident interest in character formation, rather than leaving students to make up their own minds about moral choices, and an emphasis on spiritual leadership among principals.[80] While this finding may appear attractive to those who have defended recent conservative government policies, it is clear that the underlying vision operative in Catholic schools, as described by Bryk and his colleagues, is seriously at variance with much contemporary rhetoric about market metaphors and

morality, for example "radical individualism and the sense of purpose organized around competition and the pursuit of individual economic rewards."[81] The kinds of instrumental levers, such as school improvement plans and accountability systems[82] - in England we might add to these appraisal and inspection - advocated in public educational policy are shown to be based on a narrow and incomplete understanding of human nature and motivation. Too many public schools display a lack of moral authority, whereas in Catholic schools there is a strong commitment to the dignity of each person and a shared responsibility for advancing a just and caring society. The sense of community flowing from an expression in the daily life of the school of such images as the person of Christ, the notion of the Kingdom of God and the resurrection destiny to which we are called is one that is powerful, integrative, deepening and evocative, in a way that an overemphasis on test scores, performance standards and professional accountability can never be.[83]

I emphasise the wealth of evidence on which the book is built, especially its range, for several reasons. First, it brings out the great diversity that exists behind the simple phrase 'Catholic school'. These institutions are not monolithic. Second, the descriptions of the different circumstances of the schools bring out the importance of context as a factor both in their effectiveness and in the particularity of their expression of Catholicism. Third, despite the wide range of different contexts in which Catholic schools operate, one of the striking features of Bryk's interpretation is that what these schools have in common is far more important than the differences between them. Fourth, whereas Arthur's book seeks to provoke the Catholic community to bring its schools more into line with Catholic principles, Bryk's work is addressed to the wider academy and educational policy-makers in order to prompt them to consider the relevance and possible transferability of key features of Catholic schools to the public sector. Arthur, in addressing the Catholic community, relies on

evidence and perspectives which are accepted as valid and relevant by that community. Bryk's work relies much more heavily on social science and empirical evidence, particularly statistical evidence, than does Arthur, whose work exhibits both a longer historical perspective and a more personal interpretation.

The Ebbing Tide is passionate, angry, committed and relies for its persuasiveness on readers already sharing the author's presuppositions regarding the integrity and value of Catholicism. It challenges Catholics to reaffirm the distinctiveness of their schools. By contrast, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good* is more detached, more tentative in its interpretations, rests on no explicit commitment to religious faith and merely presses readers (and policy-makers) to be open to the possibility that some features of Catholic schools might profitably be replicated in the public sector. It also follows logically from Bryk's argument that the constitutional ban on funding for Catholic schools might be reconsidered.

1.4.2 Taking up position: proximity and distance

How, then, do I place my thesis in relation to the arguments in these two major studies by Arthur and Bryk? With regard to Arthur, there are four points to be made here. First, I wish to associate myself with his analysis that recent British government education policies have been built upon a philosophy of life and set of values which are seriously at odds with a Catholic worldview. Second, I wish to disassociate myself from his suggestion that Catholic principles relating to education have been 'betrayed', either by bishops or by teachers in Catholic schools. Although if his case rests on a weak sense of 'betrayal', meaning an insufficiently deliberate, energetic and sustained campaign to defend essential features of Catholic education, his accusation is, I

believe, partly true, while remaining too harsh a judgement to be accepted without careful qualification.

Third, I fully accept two implications of his argument: first, namely that the Catholic 'story' about education needs to be freshly articulated in the context of our society and in the light of the re-appraisal of Catholic theology which has taken place since the Second Vatican Council and second, that much needs to be done to ensure that teachers in Catholic schools are familiar with, enthused by, committed to and capable of living out this 'story' through their professional work and personal example. My thesis aims precisely to contribute to the first of these tasks.

Fourth, in contributing to a fresh articulation of a Catholic philosophy of education my approach may well differ in several ways from Arthur's in that I am less anxious than he is about plurality within Catholicism while feeling at the same time less confident than he appears to be that the Catholic 'story' is unproblematical. As already indicated, I focus especially on the previously unresolved (often not even realised) tension between the twin imperatives within Catholic education, to be distinctive and inclusive. I also think that a philosophy of Catholic education will be better grounded, more fertile for its adherents and lead to a more truly Catholic relationship between faith and culture if it emerges from an ongoing dialogue between people at all levels within the church and within schools, including those at the margins and in response to questions and criticisms from those outside the church. In this respect I believe that my employment of the notion of 'living tradition' offers a more inclusive conception of church than that which pervades *The Ebbing Tide*, where the objective and institutional pole tends to subsume the subjective and personal pole rather than relate to it in a more reciprocal manner.

In relation to Bryk there are four further points to be made here. First, there are important differences between the context in which Catholic schools operate in the USA and that in the United Kingdom.[84] As examples of differences in context I would mention funding arrangements, the respective strengths of religious orders, and, in parallel with this, the degree to which lay leadership has been assumed in schools.[85] In addition there is the greater degree to which Catholic schools in England and Wales are subject to state regulation,[86] the extent to which society is secularized, the nature and impact of government policies and the respective positions of church and state in the two countries. These differences should make us cautious in seeking too close a correlation in the functioning of Catholic schools. This is not to deny their common features. There are differences too in what the respective common schools are like, for example, with regard to curriculum, standards, acceptable levels of behaviour, governance and accountability. These differences between the two systems make comparisons difficult between Catholic schools in the USA and the UK regarding either quality of education or commitment to mission.

Second, Bryk's work demonstrates, among other things, some of those defects of managerialism as well as the need for visionary leadership I mentioned earlier. The authors claim at the end of their study: "the problems of contemporary schooling are broader than the ineffective use of instrumental authority. At base is an absence of moral authority."[87] The application of a 'public theology' in school, functioning as an 'inspirational ideology' matches Postman's call for a 'metaphysical' rather than an 'engineering' approach to education, with which I aligned my own position.[88]

Third, Bryk's work provides evidence in support of the case that Catholic schools do contribute to the common good, a case I develop at some length (in chapter seven) in

response to my consideration of a range of objections to the maintenance of state-supported separate Catholic schools in a plural society.

However, fourth, the depiction by Bryk *et al.* of the 'public theology' or the 'inspirational ideology' of Catholic schools, (terms which they use interchangeably,) is, in my judgement, inadequate. It does not serve as a foundation for Postman's overarching narrative, nor for that fresh articulation of a Catholic philosophy of education that Arthur indicated as necessary and which I hope to contribute to here. This inadequacy is due partly to the question the authors were seeking to answer: 'what makes Catholic schools particularly effective, in secular terms?' In itself, this is a perfectly valid question to ask. But in order to achieve a deeper penetration of the 'public theology' of Catholic schools a different question must also be asked : 'what makes them particularly effective as *Catholic* schools?'

One cannot complain that the theological elements included by Bryk (et al) are inaccurate or misleadingly stated. For Bryk does satisfactorily bring out (pp.35-41.) the shift from a neo-scholastic form of Catholic theology to one which he calls 'social Catholicism', hinting at some of the associated shifts in nuance over rationality, freedom, authority, spirituality, sense of community and relationship between church and world.[89] Furthermore, his emphasis on dignity, responsibility, social justice and persons-in-community and the role of 'symbolic images' (p.303.), such as Christ, the Kingdom of God and our Resurrection destiny, does reflect pervasive elements within modern Catholicism.

However, the scope of his analysis precludes any in-depth treatment of the underlying 'architecture', coherence, richness and diversity of Catholic theology and how this relates to Catholic education. This would have to include Christology, ecclesiology,

anthropology and the application of a sacramental perspective to curriculum issues. The sinful human condition, the call to conversion, the path to redemption, the need for salvation and the relationship between nature and grace are among the elements that are not brought out sufficiently. Treatment of these would have provided a context for greater appreciation of the centrality of Christ, the kingdom he preached and his invitation to new life.

The authors do succeed in representing an 'inspirational ideology' for Catholic education, but not, I contend, a 'public theology'. One way of distinguishing between the two is to view an 'inspirational ideology' as a loosely connected set of slogans which (a) function as summaries of key themes within a belief system, (b) attract and focus the energies of those they are directed towards and (c) serve the interests of the sponsoring body (in this case, the church). By comparison, a theology is, at its simplest, a reflection on our knowledge and experience of God, and in more academic terms, a systematic reflection on the faith experience of the church or believing community; it will interrogate the nature, meaning, foundations, coherence and implications of a religious tradition's truth claims, worship and lifestyle. I assume that the modifier 'public' merely indicates an effort to spell out the bearing of the theology on an area of public life, such as politics, work, or education. While an 'inspirational ideology' may not necessarily conflict with a 'public theology', it operates at a shallower level, does not depend on a *habitus* or disposition of personal belief and does not require the same critical underpinning. It tends to 'look out from', to adopt, or to borrow elements from a belief system, rather than to 'look back' *at* them in reflection or to inhabit them in any depth, with conviction, as a totality and with a sense of ownership.

In Bryk's treatment of Catholic schools the elements of the 'ideology' are incomplete, with too little justice being done to the traditional 'story', they are presented uncritically and they are insufficiently related to one another. While the potential of Catholic education to be inclusive in its practice is demonstrated, such inclusiveness is not sufficiently related to Catholic principles. In turn this is because issues of distinctiveness are not adequately treated. I maintain that neither of the two terms - distinctiveness and inclusiveness - can be properly understood without a highly developed appreciation of the other. This is the task I have addressed here.

Notes and References to chapter one

[1]For example, sermons, liturgy, missions, catechesis, sodalities, sacramental participation, religious literature, pilgrimages, scripture study and other forms of adult and higher education. According to the highly influential and widely recognized international expert on religious education, Gabriel Moran, "[A]ny effective teaching of a religious way of life requires a range of settings for teaching: in the family, in the religious congregation, in struggles for justice, in contemplative silence, as well as in the classroom." Moran, *Showing How: The Act of Teaching*, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, Trinity Press International, 1997, p.3.

[2]Edward Farley (originally 1985),'Can church education be theological education?' in *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation*, edited by Jeff Astley, Leslie Francis and Colin Crowder, Leominster, Gracewing, 1996, p.42. says that "ordered learning...refers to self-conscious attempts, usually in a corporate setting, to transmit by means of a sequential process of disciplined didactic activity both the insights and deposits of the past and the methods and modes of thought and work which enable new insights."

[3]According to *Education in Catholic Schools and Colleges : Principles, Practices and Concerns*, A Statement from the Catholic Bishops of England and Wales, Catholic Education Service, (Manchester, Gabriel Communications, 1996), p.2., there are 2000 primary and 450 secondary schools, with 746,000 pupils and 35,000 teachers, plus a further 190 primary and secondary schools in the independent sector. In addition, there are 17 Catholic sixth form colleges, catering specifically for the 16-19 age range and 5 Catholic Colleges of Higher Education. (During the completion of this thesis it was announced that La Sainte Union, Southampton, the sixth such Catholic HE College, was to be closed following an unsatisfactory inspection report.) Two Catholic primary and eight secondary schools are part of an ecumenical educational endeavour. It is not yet clear whether or not these experiments are to be seen as pioneering efforts, offering a creative new way forward for Christian education or whether they will be seen in the long-term as heralds of a false dawn. See Priscilla Chadwick, *Schools of Reconciliation*, London, Cassell, 1994, whose case study of two such schools (one in Northern Ireland, one in England) is the only substantial and thorough analysis of the ecumenical experiment in education currently available. Grant aid for maintained Catholic primary and secondary schools has risen since 1944, from 50%, to 75% in 1959, 80% in 1967, to 85% in 1975. Catholic schools which have achieved Grant Maintained status since 1992 are in receipt of 100% state funding. Catholic schools are also strongly represented in the independent sector. Michael Hornsby-Smith, *Catholic Education : The Unobtrusive Partner*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1978, p.16. records that in 1960, one in five Catholic schools were independent. Maurice Whitehead updates this picture in 'The Changing Face of the Catholic Independent Schools' in *Private and Independent Education*, edited by V.A.McClelland, (Aspects of Education, No.35, University of Hull, 1986.

Traditionally these independent schools have always included a significantly higher proportion of non-Catholic pupils (in 1997 this is about 50%) than is the case in Catholic schools which are in receipt of government grant aid. This feature, added to the fact that they also have a higher proportion of non-Catholic teachers (currently about 44%) calls into question some of the arguments put forward in some UK dioceses for preserving a minimum quota of 85% Catholic pupils as necessary for maintaining the Catholic nature of a school. Historically, too, mission schools run by Catholics in, for example, India and Africa, have often included a majority of pupils who are not Catholic, as well as a large number of non-Catholic staff. The severe reduction in the number of religious staff involved in Catholic schools has taken place more slowly than in the maintained sector.

[4]A summary of the evidence (from 1993-1996) about standards of achievement, quality of education and religious ethos in Catholic schools is provided in *Learning from OFSTED and Diocesan Inspections*, Catholic Education Service, London, 1996. An earlier study, also published by the CES (in 1995) is *Quality of Education in Catholic Secondary Schools*.

[5]My contention is distinct from, although not entirely unrelated to, Hornsby-Smith's comment (in 1978) that "the size and coverage of the Catholic education system in England and Wales is such that it presents considerable organizational problems of control, goal specification, task achievement, co-ordination and management styles." (Hornsby-Smith, *op.cit.*, p.12.)

[6]A biblical warrant for accommodating ourselves to all people so as to help them to have a share in the blessings of the gospel is suggested by 1 Corinthians 9.19-23.

[7]As Higgins says, "an emphasis on establishing Christian identity need not mean a discontinuation of efforts at mutual understanding between different groups." See 'The significance of postliberalism for religious education', in Astley, Francis and Crowder, 1996, *op.cit.*, p.144. Higgins complains that "liberalism has diminished the ability of Christians to see themselves as a people with a distinctive vision," and, by implication, in so doing has inhibited their capacity to bring anything specific or distinctive to dialogue with people of other faiths or of different persuasions. *ibid.*, p.141. Lack of attention by religious groups to the preservation of distinctive narratives and ways of life can remove any semblance of substance from inter-faith dialogue and in the process of neglecting boundaries and reducing distance can empty encounters between people of different faith of their potential richness, challenge and creativity.

[8]The notion of humans being made in God's image is considered in chapter four, section 4.7.

[9]For examples of such management literature, see Brent Davies and John West-Burnham (eds), *Reengineering and Total Quality in Schools*, London, Pitman, 1997 [for the deficiencies of the metaphor of engineering as applied to education see Postman, note 23, below] ; Brent Davies and Linda Ellison, *School Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*, London, Routledge, 1997; Dilum Jirasinghe and Geoffrey Lyons, *The Competent Head*, London, Falmer, 1996; S. Murgatroyd and C. Morgan, *Total Quality Management and the School*, Buckingham, Open University Press,

1993; H.O. Jenkins, *Getting it Right*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1991; Tony Bush and John West-Burnham, (eds), *Principles of Educational Management*, Harlow, Longman, 1994. For criticisms of managerialism in education and for analyses of various associated deficiencies relating to markets, competencies, and other defects such as confusing management with leadership, as well as for questions about the applicability of private sector, commercial and industrial models of management to public sector services, see: Stephen Ball, S.Gewirtz and R Bowe, *Markets, Choice and Equity in Education*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1995; David Bridges and Terence McLaughlin (eds), *Education and the Market Place*, London, Falmer Press, 1994; S.Ranson and J. Stewart, *Management for the Public Domain*, Basingstoke, St Martin's Press/Macmillan, 1994; Jenny Ozga, 'Deskilling and Professions: Professionalism, Deprofessionalisation and the new managerialism', in *Managing Teachers as Professionals*, edited by Hugh Busher and Rene Saran, London, Kogan Page, 1995; Gerald Grace, *School Leadership*, London, Falmer Press, 1995; and Ruth Jonathan, 'Illusory Freedoms : Liberalism, Education and the Market', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol.31, no.1., 1997

[10]Richard Pring brings out the shadow-side, the consequences (in most cases unintended) of recent government education policy: "The advisory bodies have been abolished; the Schools Council closed down; Her Majesty's Inspectorate as an independent critical voice emasculated; the countervailing influence of local education authorities enfeebled; the language of education impoverished; the curriculum imposed by politicians; the inevitably perennial deliberation over what is worth learning foreclosed." 'Values and Education Policy', in *Values in Education and Education in Values*, edited by Mark Halstead and Monica Taylor, London, Falmer Press, 1996, p.117. cf. also his 'Markets, Education and Catholic Schools', in *The Contemporary Catholic School*, edited by Terence McLaughlin, Joseph O'Keefe and Bernadette O'Keeffe, London, Falmer Press, 1996.

[11]Ronald Barnett provides a sustained critique of recent reliance on competencies in higher education in *The Limits of Competence*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1994. His criticisms are relevant to the wider field of educational management. Richard Roberts provides a brief yet powerful critique of the damaging effects of some of the measures which accompany managerialism in higher education in 'Our Graduate Factories', *The Tablet*,11th October 1997, pp.1295-1297. A notable exception in educational management literature to the omission of treatment of the personhood and emotions of leaders and teachers is David Loader, *The Inner Principal*, London, Falmer Press, 1997. Loader shows that a new sensitivity to self, a new awareness of others and a better understanding of the educational task are intimately connected with one another.

[12]For a different set of criticisms of what she calls 'Jurassic Management', see Helen Gunter, *Rethinking Education*, London, Cassell, 1997.

[13]Jasper Ungoed-Thomas, 'Vision, Values and Virtues', in Halstead and Taylor, *op.cit.*, p.144.

[14]As laid down in 1996 by the Teacher Training Agency for newly qualified teachers, for subject leaders, for those preparing for headship and for experienced headteachers.

[15]Joseph Dunne, *Back to the Rough Ground*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1993, commenting on the Greek term *techne*, says that "it enshrined... a concern...with a knowledge that is explanatory, generalized, systematic, and transmissible, and is at the same time a source of reliable control over the facts that it brings within its ambit." (p.228.) He compares this with *phronesis*, which has an 'experiential nature', an "immediacy of involvement in concrete situations and the responsiveness and resourcefulness in these situations that come to it only from the character and dispositions of the person, formed in the course of his life-history, and not from any knowledge that can be made available in treatises or manuals." (*Ibid.*) This *phronesis* guides *praxis*, which is conduct in which a person "acts in such a way as to realize excellences that he has come to appreciate in his community as constitutive of a worthwhile way of life." (ibid., p.10.) Wilfred Carr reminds us that *phronesis* was translated into Latin as *prudentia* and that the 'practical wisdom' which is meant to be captured by these terms is "the virtue of knowing if, when and how to apply other virtues." ('Professing Education in a Postmodern Age', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol.31, no. 2, July 1997, p.323.) Carr stresses that such practical wisdom cannot be acquired without "study, effort, perseverance and submission to the authority of a teacher from whom such qualities as concentration, exactness, respect for the truth, honesty, patience and humility can be learned;" and he goes on (*ibid.*) to quote Alasdair MacIntyre on the practical judgement or principled decision exhibited in *phronesis* or *prudentia* as a desire "to do the right thing in the right place at the right time in the right way," a phrasing which itself echoes Aristotle, who analyses *phronesis* in Book IV, chapter 9 of *The Nichomachean Ethics*. Cf. Richard Bernstein, *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism, Oxford*, Basil Blackwell, 1983, pp.54, 146, 147. Bernstein points out that *phronesis* involves the mediation between general principles and a concrete particular situation and that it has to be nurtured by a *polis* or community.

[16]Margret Buchman and Robert Floden, (eds) *Detachment and Concern : Conversations in the Philosophy of Teaching and Teacher Education*, London, Cassell, 1993, pp.211-216. bring out several dimensions of uncertainty in teaching, for example, those relating to assessments of student learning, to the effects of their teaching, as well as uncertainties about content and the scope of teachers' authority. "Too much uncertainty may be disabling, but too much certainty can lead to boredom and stagnation or to the mistaken sense that teaching is mechanical." *ibid.*, p.216. Cf. the insights of Shaun Gallagher, *Hermeneutics and Education*, State University of New York Press, 1992 : "Teaching can never be reduced to the transmission of information but is the attempt to bring the student into a conversation precisely where the conversation is uncertain, indeterminate - where the teacher cannot answer the question - where the question remains a question." (p.76.) Donal Murray brings out a different aspect of uncertainty for teachers : "the great paradox of education is that it is an enterprise in which adults attempt to prepare young people to live in a world

which the adults cannot even imagine." (*A Special Concern - The Philosophy of Education : A Christian Perspective*, Dublin, Veritas, 1991, p.3.)

[17]Stephen Pattison, in *The Faith of the Managers*, (London, Cassell, 1997, p.2.) highlights the religious tone and imagery used in much management language. He refers to management as "a set of ideas, rituals, practices and words...that provide a total world view and way of life that binds existence and organizations together and shapes people, purposes and actions in a fundamental way." *cf. ibid.*, p.39.

[18]Pattison refers to the tendency, in organizations under the sway of managerialism, to require an "unthinking acceptance of 'official' reality as determined from above." *Ibid.*, p.54.

[19]Furthermore, as Pattison says, "just because something is called a vision does not mean that it is automatically good, true, unchallengeable, right and useful for the organization.". *Ibid.*, p.70.

[20]*Ibid.*, p.71.

[21]In England and Wales compulsory teacher appraisal was introduced in July 1991, the new, regular and comprehensive system of inspection started in September 1993 and, after a turbulent introductory period, the publication of national league tables for pupil performance in schools became a reality by 1995. Pattison compares the function of appraisal (or individual performance review) with that of confession in mediaeval Catholicism. "It is a means of engendering conformity and control in the individual." He goes on to claim that "appraisal is, in some ways, the most personally immediate sign and sacrament of the modern managed organization." *Ibid.*, pp.196-197.

[22]See Appendix 1 for an examination of some difficulties about teachers in Catholic schools.

[23]Neil Postman, *The End of Education*, New York, Vintage Books, 1996, p.3.

[24]*Ibid.*, pp.5-6.

[25]*Ibid.*, p.6.

[26]*Ibid.*, p.7.

[27]"The idea of public education depends absolutely on the existence of shared narratives *and* the exclusion of narratives that lead to alienation and divisiveness." Postman, *op.cit.*, p.17.

[28]For a not entirely favourable reading of Postman's book, see Bradley Levinson, in *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 66, No. 4, 1996, pp.873-878. Levinson is critical (p.878.) of Postman's bland formula for 'cultural pluralism' and his strident rhetoric at the straw figure of multiculturalism. I do not think that weaknesses in his analyses of particular narratives are fatal to the main thrust of Postman's argument.

[29]Postman also reviews, as narratives which have served in the past as a foundation for education, nationalism, reason, communism, science, technology, economic utility and consumership. He considers several possible candidates for the future, for example, the fallen angel, humans as word-weavers and world-makers. For an alternative rendering of key narratives or perspectives which have informed western

education, see E.D. Macpherson, 'Chaos in the Curriculum', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol.27, No.3, May-June, 1995, pp.263-279, where he summarises (at pp.273-4.) Platonic, republican, scientific, do-it-yourself, neo-Marxist, service of God as well as precise curriculum engineering views. For a succinct defence of the role of ideals in life, even ideals which we know we cannot attain, see Nicholas Rescher, *Ethical Idealism*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1987.

[30]See Paddy Walsh, *Education and Meaning*, London, Cassell, 1993.

[31]Christopher Dawson, (originally writing in 1961), quoted by V.A.McClelland in *Christian Education in a Pluralist Society*, London, Routledge, 1988, p.28.

[32]Although Peters was not guilty of separating educational aims from consideration of the good life, much work in philosophy of education which followed in his footsteps in the 1960s and 1970s did appear to disconnect educational analysis from larger social and spiritual purposes. A landmark study was R.S.Peters, *Ethics and Education*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1966. In an increasingly plural and secular society it is not surprising that discussion of education policy becomes detached from particular narratives which might hold the allegiance of only a minority of citizens and appeals more and more to general procedural (rather than to substantive) principles.

[33]Alasdair MacIntyre has been a leading figure in restoring narrative to academic respectability. See especially his *After Virtue* (1981) and *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (1988), both London, Duckworth.

[34]For penetrating analyses and judicious assessments of the significance of postmodernism for either religious or educational theory and practice, see Michael Paul Gallagher *Clashing Symbols*, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1997, chapter 8 and also his chapter 'The New Agenda of Unbelief and Faith' in *Religion and Culture in Dialogue*, edited by Dermot Lane, Dublin, The Columba Press, 1993; Board of Education of the General Synod of the Church of England, *Tomorrow is Another Country*, The National Society, London, 1996; Wilfred Carr, 'Professing Education in a Postmodern Age', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1997; Wilfred Carr, 'Education and Democracy: confronting the postmodern challenge', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1995; Paul Standish, 'Postmodernism and the Education of the Whole Person', *ibid.*; Paul Smeyers, 'Education and the Educational Project I: the atmosphere of post-modernism', *ibid.*

[35]In the case of the Christian 'narrative', its normative status depends upon claims about *historical* truths and it also partially depends on the proclamation of truths about how things *are*.

[36]Commenting on Spinoza's dictum *omnis determinatio est negatio*, David Norton says: "knowledge of oneself entails knowledge of what one is not - the 'is' and 'is not' mutually implicate one another." (*Imagination, Understanding, and the Virtue of Liberality*, Lanham, Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1996, p.16.)

[37]"Replacing the whole-parts distinction with the system-environment distinction moves away from the static, reductionist paradigm where a system is conceived of as the same as the sum of its parts which, once understood, leads to an understanding of

how the whole works, to the holistic, dynamic paradigm where the system is recognized as being something *more* than just the sum of its parts. Within a holistic perspective, a system's unity is not to be found in how constituting elements fit together, but rather in *how the system distinguishes itself from its environment.*" (Emphasis in original.) Allan Beavis & A. Ross Thomas, 'Metaphor as Storehouses of Expectation', *Educational Management & Administration,* vol. 24, no. 1, pp.93-106, 1996, at p.95.

[38]I explore some of the tensions between liberal and Catholic education in chapter five. For analyses and critiques of liberal education, see Ruth Jonathan, 'Liberal Philosophy of Education: a paradigm under strain', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* vol. 29, no. 1, 1995; Terence McLaughlin, 'Liberalism, education and the common school', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* vol 29, no. 2, 1995; Ruth Jonathan, *Illusory Freedoms: Liberalism, Education and the Market,* Oxford, Blackwell, 1997. In this latter work Jonathan powerfully brings out both the atomistic depiction of persons and the inadequate concern for collective goods which permeates most expressions of liberal education. Eamonn Callan, in *Creating Citizens,* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997, (chapters 6 and 7) explores some of the tensions for those wanting a religious form of education in a society with a predominantly liberal form of education. Two (very different) critiques of the damaging effects of a liberal approach to (higher) education from Christian perspectives are those by David Schindler, *Heart of the World, Center of the Church,* Edinburgh, T & T Clark/Grand Rapids, Michigan, Eerdmans, 1996 and by George Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship,* New York, Oxford University Press, 1997. Elmer Thiessen's *Teaching for Commitment,* Leominster, Gracewing (and Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press), 1993, is a major study of the relationship between liberal education and Christian nurture. See especially Thiessen, pp.35-38, 40, 44 for analysis of the characteristics and values of modern liberal education. A useful critique of these is also provided by Eoin Cassidy's chapter, 'Irish Educational Policy in a Philosophical Perspective: The Legacy of Liberalism', in *Religion, Education and the Constitution,* edited by Dermot Lane, Dublin, The Columba Press, 1992. Cassidy argues the case for a counterbalance to liberalism in education. This counterbalance would entail recognition of the interpersonal dimension of human nature, a stress on cultural memory enshrined in tradition and opposition to both relativism and economic pragmatism. Cassidy, *op.cit.*, p.76.

[39]See chapter seven, section 7.4.3 for an explanation of this term and an argument that separate Catholic schools, as constitutive communities, can be defended on the grounds that they contribute to the common good.

[40]As an extreme example of a strong but narrow view of transmission, see Robert Maynard Hutchins, *The Higher Learning in America,* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1936, p.36. "Education implies teaching. Teaching implies knowledge. Knowledge is truth. The truth is everywhere the same. I do not overlook the possibilities of differences in organisation, in administration, in local habits and customs. These are details." I have taken this quotation from Amy Gutman, ed. of *Multiculturalism* by Charles Taylor, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994p.16.

For the importance of the notion of 'reception' within Catholicism, see Frederick Bliss, *Understanding Reception*, Marquette University Press, 1993 and Daniel Finucane, *Sensus Fidelium : The Uses of a Concept in the Post-Vatican II Era*, San Francisco, International Scholars Press, 1996.

[41]As Jaroslav Pelikan says, "tradition is the living faith of the dead; traditionalism is the dead faith of the living....It is traditionalism that gives tradition such a bad name." *The Vindication of Tradition*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1984, p.65. With regard to active learning, Jerome Bruner comments: "we want learners to gain good judgement, to become self-reliant, to work well with each other. Such competencies do not flourish under a one-way 'transmission' regimen." *The Culture of Education*, Harvard University Press, 1996, p.21.

[42]This emphasis on transformation as the essential and proper relation of education to tradition echoes that of H.G. Gadamer in *Truth and Method*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1975. Gallagher summarises Gadamer's view thus: "in educational experience, traditions are continued, not as a reproduced past, but as a transformed past, insofar as they are challenged and questioned, and insofar as they take on new meanings in our present interpretations....If educational experience is primarily directed to the unfamiliar it also involves the possibility of throwing the familiar into question...Interpretations...never simply repeat, copy, reproduce, reconstruct, or restore the interpreted in its originality. Interpretation produces something new." *op.cit.*, pp.99,124, 128. Cf. the treatment of the notion of a 'canon', for example, of great literature, by Anthony Quinton and Anthony O'Hear (in The Victor Cook Memorial Lectures, *Education, Values and Culture*, Centre for Philosophy and Public Affairs, University of St Andrews, 1992). Both bring out very clearly how tradition plays an absolutely crucial role in providing a foundation for any creative thought and they show that tradition need not inhibit the development of personal perspectives. "Acknowledged masterpieces...serve to set the standards, to raise the questions, to delineate the possibilities" within a realm of meaning. (O'Hear, p.58) Although they acknowledge that the canon and the tradition are still developing, they both fail, however, to do full justice to the degree to which students should, in the educational process, be introduced to a *living* tradition, including some of its (currently) unresolved problems and disputed questions.

[43]See chapter seven for further treatment of Murray's main contributions to Catholic thinking and its relevance to Catholic education.

[44]Murray, quoted by Robert Cuervo in *John Courtney Murray and the American Civil Conversation*, edited by Robert Hunt and Kenneth Grasso, Grand Rapids, Michigan, William Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992, p.87. The quotation is from Murray's *We Hold These Truths*, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1960, p.117. Murray goes on (p.91.) to comment that although "we will tolerate all kinds of ideas, however pernicious,...we will not tolerate the idea of an orthodoxy."

[45]Will Kymlica, *Multicultural Citizenship*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995, p.204. "External protections are intended to ensure that people are able to maintain their way of life *if they so choose*, and are not prevented from doing so by the decisions of people outside the community."

[46]Eamonn Callan, 'The Great Sphere : Education against Servility', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1997, pp. 223, 226.

[47]I explore this further in Appendix 1. Kymlica acknowledges that internal dissent can have a destabilizing effect on a community and that some degree of internal restriction is necessary. He also recognises also that a liberal society may advocate a degree of freedom which, if applied internally to a religious group, might seriously undermine it. "A liberal society not only allows individuals the freedom to pursue their existing faith, but it also allows them to seek new adherents for their faith (proselytization is allowed), or to question the doctrine of their church (heresy is allowed), or to renounce their faith entirely and convert to another faith or to atheism (apostasy is allowed). It is quite conceivable to have the freedom to pursue one's current faith without having any of these latter freedoms." *op.cit.*, p.82. cf. Callan, *loc. cit.*, p.226. : "To be denied a sympathetic understanding of ethical diversity by parents who seek to preserve unswerving identification with the primary culture they favour is to be denied the deliberative raw material for independent thought about the right and the good." In such a situation the rights and proper scope of conscience would be ignored.

[48]Patrick Hannon asks if 'openness' is the enemy of 'faithfulness', 'dialogue' at odds with 'prophecy'? in *Church State Morality & Law*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1992, p.128.

[49]For examples of changes in Catholic self-understanding, see F. Bliss, *op.cit.*; Owen O'Sullivan, *The Silent Schism : Renewal of Catholic Spirit and Structures*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1997; Dermot Lane, *Religion and Culture in Dialogue*, Dublin, Columba Press, 1993; and D. Finucane, *op.cit.*

[50]Alasdair MacIntyre, *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?*, London, Duckworth, 1988, pp.361-2. An epistemological crisis occurs when the range of unsolved problems and unresolved issues within a tradition prove so untractable that they lead to sterility, incoherence and a breakdown of certitude.

[51]Paul Hypher in *The Contemporary Catholic School*, edited by T. McLaughlin, J. O'Keefe & B. O'Keeffe, London, Falmer Press, 1996, p.230.

[52]Terence McLaughlin (1996) *op.cit.*, p.139. The recognition of this deficiency is not new. A.E.C. Spencer, observed that "the unsatisfactory state of Catholic educational philosophy is widely lamented." 'An Evaluation of Roman Catholic Educational Policy in England and Wales 1900 - 1960', in *Religious Education : Drift or Decision?*, edited by Philip Jebb, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1968, p.169.

[53]Jonathan Chaplin, in a critique of William Kymlica, *(Liberalism, Community & Culture*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1989) complains that "cultural communities may preserve their distinctiveness, but only within the limits determined by liberalism. They can be distinctive so long as they are liberal (or on the road to becoming liberal). But the problem Kymlica fails to address, or even notice, is that *if they become liberal, they may thereby have lost much of their distinctiveness.* ...He seems to assume that a community can be liberalised without essentially changing its particular

character at all, but he can do so only by assuming that liberalism has no particular character of its own...The failure to acknowledge the particularity of liberal culture enables Kymlica to imply that the culture he envisages is inclusive while the other cultures are exclusive (and so need liberalising)." Chaplin, in *Liberalism, Multiculturalism and Toleration*, edited by John Horton, London, Macmillan, 1993, pp.45-6.

[54]James Arthur, *The Ebbing Tide : Policy and Principles of Catholic Education*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1995. This originated in a 1992 DPhil thesis at Oxford University. Gerald Grace, in his review essay of *The Ebbing Tide*, 'Is there a sea-change in Catholic Education?', *Education and Ethos*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1998, brings out slightly different aspects of Arthur's case; this review complements rather than contradicts my own critique of Arthur's work.

[55]In the terms of this thesis, Arthur's case might be that distinctiveness has been sacrificed in the interests of (a false understanding of) inclusiveness.

[56]"The bishops have failed to establish any solid base from which to criticise government education programmes." *ibid.*, p.68.

[57]I say more about these in chapter two.

[58]*Ibid.*, p.186.

[59]I base this view on more than twenty years' experience of staff selection and twelve years of providing inservice training. My view has been confirmed by many diocesan officers with whom I have worked in that period. Many answers given in interviews by candidates for teaching posts in Catholic schools are frequently poor with regard to the Catholic dimension of education. Similarly, many inadequate responses are given by both recently appointed and experienced (and senior) staff during inservice sessions which explore the implications of a Catholic approach to curriculum, community and management issues.

[60]For example, *Evaluating the Distinctive Nature of the Catholic School*, (third edition), London, Catholic Education Service, (CES) 1994; *Spiritual and Moral Development*, CES, 1995; *The Common Good and Catholic Social Teaching*, 1996, *Religious Education : Curriculum Directory for Catholic Schools*, 1996, *A Struggle for Excellence*, 1997, *The Common Good in Education*, 1997, and *Catholic Schools & Other Faiths*, 1997, all from the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales.

[61]Arthur's comment that "there are in fact many differing interpretations of Catholic education current" seems to me to be a lament as much as a statement of fact. (*op. cit.*, p.81.)

[62]For this distinction see Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1972, pp.xi,124, 301, 326, 363.

[63]For nuanced treatments of the relation between faith and culture see Michael Paul Gallagher, *Clashing Symbols*, London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1997; Dermot Lane (ed) *Religion and Culture in Dialogue*, Dublin, Columba Press, 1993; Eoin Cassidy (ed) *Faith and Culture in the Irish Context*, Dublin, Veritas, 1996; and

Michael Himes and Stephen Pope (eds) *Finding God in All Things*, New York, The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1996.

[64]Anthony Bryk, Valerie Lee & Peter Holland, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Harvard University Press, 1993.

[65]All US Catholic schools are private in the sense that they receive no grant aid from the state.

[66]It appears that, in the sequence of his enquiries, Bryk began by challenging Coleman's statistics about the *social* effectiveness of Catholic schools by re-examining the statistical data about them. (See J.S. Coleman's two books (1982), *High School Achievement : Public, Catholic and private schools compared*, and (1987), *Public and private high schools*, both New York, Basic Books.) Then he analysed factors indicating that the schools were distinctive - notably in curriculum and community-building. This led to an exploration of the philosophical base or the metanarrative of these schools, which itself was transformed in the years after Vatican II from a neo-scholasticism or neo-Thomism to a theology which gave a strong emphasis to an option for the poor. (Bryk's inclusion of Karl Rahner in his list [p.40.] of neo-scholastics is slightly misleading, since this theologian's transcendental form of Thomism differed in some respects from 'mainstream' neo-scholasticism.) Bryk sees an important *continuing* influence of neo-scholasticism within Catholic education after Vatican II, one that is evident in the faith in rationality implicit in the (more restricted and traditional) curriculum approach adopted by Catholic schools in the USA. Such faith in rationality is buttressed further by a continuing non-relativism.

[67]This should include both those committed to and those opposed to separate religious schools, as well as educational policy makers in Britain and other English-speaking countries.

[68]See pp.29-30, below.

[69]Cf. the British government White Paper, *Choice and Diversity*, London, 1992. For a critique of these values, see the two chapters by Richard Pring referred to above (note 10) and also his essay in *Education, Values and the State*, University of St Andrews, 1994.

[70]Bryk (et al) *op.cit.*, p.15.

[71]*Ibid.*, p.10.

[72]*Ibid.*, pp.72-3.

[73]*Ibid.*, p.34.

[74]*Ibid.*, p.11.

[75]*Ibid.*, pp.77-8.

[76]*Ibid.*, pp.93, 97, 124, 136, 220.

[77]See note 68.

[78]*Ibid.*, p.256.

[79]*Ibid.*, pp.256, 266.

[80]Students in these schools also have less choice about curriculum tracks and vocational options.

[81]*Ibid.*, p.11.

[82]*Ibid.*, p.318.

[83]*Ibid.*, p.303. Bryk (et al) claim (p.319.) that "the vision conveyed in the public school is one of *homo economicus*: rational men and women pursuing their self-interest, seeking material pleasures, guided toward individual success." They go on (p.322.) to ask: "what deeper understandings are conveyed by our common rhetoric of schools as efficient service providers to clients? Or of teachers as subject-matter specialists? Or of accountability and incentive systems designed for greater productivity? Does such rhetoric fire the hearts and minds of students and teachers?"

[84]See chapter two for further detail on the national context of Catholic education.

[85]The transfer from religious to lay leadership in Catholic schools seems to have occurred earlier and more rapidly in the UK.

[86]Bryk's claim (p.308.) that "the external regulatory shell is substantially thinner for Catholic school principals" would have to be modified to read 'marginally thinner' to apply accurately to England and Wales.

[87]*Ibid.*, p.326. In their search for the key organizational elements that produce the desired outcomes observed in Catholic high schools they focus on the 'public theology' at work in these schools and they call for "more serious dialogue between the instrumental and the evocative realms." (*ibid.*)

[88]See note 23.

[89]This must be qualified by Bryk's emphasis on the continuing influence of neo-scholasticism.

CHAPTER TWO

The Context of this Study of Catholic Education

In this chapter I set my study of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education in the particular national context of England and Wales. First, I describe a Catholic school system which is both diversified and decentralized. Second, I comment on important changes in the composition of Catholic schools and in the position of Christianity in general and of Catholicism in particular. When combined with the effects of government legislation these changes present new challenges and opportunities to Catholic educators who now need to re-examine the rationale for Catholic schools and the foundational principles which should underpin and permeate all their work. Third, I summarise theological developments within Catholicism which are relevant to re-thinking about Catholic education. Fourth, I indicate factors which have a bearing upon the lack of clarity about the distinctive nature of Catholic education currently shown by many of those involved in Catholic schools and suggest why there is a need for greater clarity. Fifth, I make a preliminary analysis of types of distinctiveness. Sixth, I offer a personal summary of a Catholic view of education in anticipation of the more extended examination carried out in chapters three and four. Finally, I analyse those general characteristics of Catholicism which provide a foundation for the distinctive components in Catholic education which are explored in the next chapter.

2.1. National Context

Since the restoration of the hierarchy in 1850 the Catholic Church in England and Wales has always given a high priority to its schools, to such an extent that, where a choice had to be made between building a church or a school, the preferred option

was to be the establishment of schools.[1] For many years their schools were seen by the Catholic community as instrumental in the preservation of their identity. Given their memories of persecution and discrimination, their experience as a minority group who remained suspect in the eyes of many, the crushing poverty suffered by many of their members living at the margins of society and the heavy burdens of paying for separate schools,[2] it is little wonder that the Catholic community jealously defended the distinctive character of its schools. Their independence from state interference was to be guarded with unceasing vigilance, while Catholics themselves would be compelled by church law to send their children to such schools.[3]

Such distinctiveness necessarily entailed a degree of exclusiveness, in the sense that the Catholic community envisaged for its schools a role in protecting children from contamination either by Protestantism or by secular ideologies. The focus was 'domestic' or inward-looking rather than seeking to serve the wider community, in so far as Catholic schools were primarily intended to educate the children of fellow Catholics. A fortress mentality for the institutional church prevailed both at the international as well as the national and local levels. Where Catholics were a minority group, as in England and Wales, this fortress mentality could lead to a ghetto situation where barriers to the outside world served also as protection from threat and as an assurance of safety for souls.

In the period between the restoration of the hierarchy and the 1944 Education Act, an Act which provided a solid basis for the continuation and extension of the 'dual system', the Catholic Church in England and Wales saw itself very much as a junior daughter within the wider Catholic world. She sought to be faithful in all things to Rome, accepted obedience as a cardinal virtue and strove to do justice to the ultramontane spirit in all matters, ranging from clergy-laity relations, styles of theology

and spiritual and moral discipline.[4] Bishops in this country saw the damaging effects of a cultural struggle in Germany, of anti-clericalism in France, of the condemnation of attempts to adapt the church in America and the crushing of modernism generally in the early years of this century. Tight discipline was maintained, wherever possible, at all levels in the English and Welsh Catholic church. Indifferentism would be guarded against, obedience would be insisted upon, experimentation ruled out and uniformity enforced. All this was part of a wider counter-cultural stance adopted by the Catholic Church, one that was to be significantly modified by the Second Vatican Council (1962-65).[5]

Despite the fact that Catholic schools have been considered crucial for the preservation of the identity and life of a highly disciplined and authoritarian church, it is perhaps surprising that both before and after the 1944 Education Act a feature of the Catholic school system in England and Wales has been the patchiness of its provision. Official church policy for education has been that all Catholic pupils should be taught by Catholic teachers in Catholic schools. The pressure on parents to send their children to church schools was 'on pain of sin'.[6] However, a significant number of Catholic pupils never attended Catholic schools. Provision has never matched the overall need for places.[7] This is mainly due to the enormous burden imposed by the increasing costs of building new schools and the uneven capacity of different Catholic communities and dioceses to meet these financial demands.

It is also partly a reflection of decentralization in the decision-making bodies of Catholic schooling. At present there are twenty-two dioceses in England and Wales. According to Canon Law, each bishop has jurisdiction over the Catholic schools in his diocese. On some issues the bishops deliberate together and release joint statements about education (and other matters).[8] But over many issues there appears to be no

coordination of episcopal decision, action or oversight regarding Catholic schools. To complicate this picture further, one must take into account the roles of several other bodies.

The Catholic Education Service acts on behalf of the Bishops' Conference in the provision of general guidance about Catholic education and in negotiations with government (and, where appropriate, opposition parties) over the implications of current or proposed policies for Catholic schools. Each diocese has a Schools Commission, with clergy and lay representation, whose full or part-time officers advise on and, in partnership with schools, implement the education policy of their own particular diocese. This task is often shared with the diocesan Religious Education Centre (sometimes called Christian Education Centre).[9]

Also to be taken into account, there are many different religious orders, both of men and women, involved in Catholic education. Some of these run their own schools and therefore are trustees in law for the property and its governance.[10] The position is made even more complex by the fact that some of the religious orders responsible for Catholic schools in England and Wales are based overseas.[11]

Each particular Catholic school, whether independent or maintained, has its own governing body, which has some members appointed by the diocesan or order trustees, some elected by the parents and, in the case of maintained schools, some nominated by local political parties. The rights and responsibilities of governors are enshrined in law. However, where perceptions and priorities about Catholic education differ and where jurisdiction appears to be either unclear or overlapping, there can be serious tensions between parents, governors, trustees and diocese.[12] These might, for example, be about decisions relating to building programmes, closure, amalgamation,

staff appointments, admission of pupils or proposals to change the nature of the school. Differences in perceptions and priorities can lead to conflict between parents, Headteacher, governors and local parishioners over staff performance, pupil discipline, the advisability of voting for Grant Maintained Status or the degree to which the Catholic ethos should be maintained.

Diversification in the structures of the United Kingdom system of education increased after legislation (in the late 1980s and the early 1990s) removed sixth form and further education colleges from local authority control and introduced City Technology Colleges, Grant Maintained and other types of school.[13] Catholic schools have been affected by these developments, which compound the complex situation described above.[14] Following increased pressure from government to diversify provision, to increase parental choice, and, in aid of that choice, to clarify the value basis and particular nature of their 'product' or 'service',[15] schools have been encouraged to emphasise their differences from one another.[16] As a response, most Catholic schools, at least since the late 1980s, have drawn up their own particular mission statement, or summary of fundamental principles, emphasising their *raison d'etre* and indicating the ideals which they hope to embody through their curriculum and ethos. While these mission statements are guided partly by the charism and tradition of a particular religious order (where that applies) and partly by the prevailing Catholic philosophy of education,[17] they also reflect the particular circumstances, perspectives and priorities of the people who draw them up.[18] The encouragement from Rome of a pastoral approach in education which is sensitive to the diversity of situations and cultures encountered by teachers sounds very different from an earlier emphasis on uniformity.[19] O'Keeffe (1992) refers to the current variety in provision as a 'patchwork quilt', one where a multiplicity of models of Catholic schools can be discerned.[20]

The more that Catholics are assimilated into society, the greater scope given to inculturation and the increased emphasis on acknowledging plurality in society, together with a reduced stress on the necessity for uniformity within the church, when combined, cannot help but lead to diversified expressions of Catholicism, in schools as elsewhere. This diversification has not yet been mapped provisionally, let alone adequately. It is not my aim here to remedy this situation. Instead, my focus is on those aspects of that philosophy of education which I believe Catholic schools should jointly subscribe to if they are to act in harmony with the church's teaching. This focus on their commonality in no way rules out scope for legitimate differences in their interpretation of how to express this philosophy in their particular circumstances, although it does restrict it.[21]

2.2 Factors for change

Many factors have contributed to important changes in the context in which Catholic education now takes place. These include the changing nature of the staff and student composition within Catholic schools, the position of Christianity in general and Catholicism in particular in society, government legislation and developments in theology. These factors will be briefly addressed in turn.

Catholic schools now have fewer staff from religious orders. Between the mid 1960s and the late 1980s the number of teachers from religious orders fell by three-quarters in the case of men and by nine-tenths in the case of women.[22] There has been a substantial increase in lay leadership, so that where most Catholic schools were at the beginning of the 1960s led by priests or religious, within less than two decades scarcely any remained in this position.[23] The percentage of staff who are not

Catholic has increased to about 12% in primary and over 40% in secondary schools. More than 10% of pupils in Catholic primary schools and more than 16% of pupils in maintained Catholic secondary schools come from non-Catholic families.[24] This change in composition presents new challenges to - and requires a fresh understanding of - distinctiveness within Catholic education, and in particular, prompts further consideration of how to relate the mission of such schools to staff and pupils who are not Catholics and how to include such people properly within the school community.

I leave on one side here the whole issue of how the 'religious' staff played a particularly powerful role in embodying the 'Catholic identity' of a school. Their explicit vocation, marked by particular charisms and spiritual traditions, a celibate lifestyle, a lengthy period of personal formation, international connections, distinct clothing and separate community life clearly contributed significantly to the development of the Catholic school system in this country, as elsewhere, and it offered a counter-cultural, even a *contra mundum* stance. However, in the light of changes in Catholic understanding of the church since Vatican II, it is a little more problematic to assume that the presence of religious can give schools their Catholic identity, even if they were available in sufficient numbers. A major task still faces Catholic schools in building on their legacy and adapting past forms of spiritual formation to current circumstances.

Christianity, and in particular the Anglican Church, still has a privileged position within English society. It is linked with parliament and with public conceptions of morality. Its influence shows in the pattern of public holidays. There is still widespread support for denominational schools, Religious Education and collective worship.[25] Many people who normally exhibit only a remote connection with church membership associate rites of passage and state occasions with religious ceremonies.

Bishops' comments on social issues are widely reported. In political life no party major wants to antagonize the churches if this can be avoided. The churches then, continue to exert a significant social influence within England and Wales.

Despite this, the position of the churches is neither clear nor secure. The presence of large numbers of adherents of faiths other than Christianity, many of whom come from races and cultures outside the United Kingdom, ensures that the term 'religious' should not be associated too readily with 'Christian', poses new demands upon the expression of neighbourliness in the context of a multi-racial society and requires of Christians a new openness to truth and goodness in previously neglected sources. The influx into English society of large numbers of Christians from a variety of cultures has two effects: first, it prompts a rethinking of what might be the essence of Christianity as compared with what might be termed 'cultural baggage', that is, accidental accretions which can be shed without serious religious loss; second, it gives renewed emphasis to the need for openness to expressions of Christianity which are less familiar but no less valid than those which are native to this country and its culture. It also calls into question an exclusive understanding of Christianity, so that it might be asked, does God speak, work and save through other religions?

Alongside this, a steady reduction in church attendance among Christians of all the main denominations, which seems to have accelerated since the early 1960s, has been one feature of the reduced grip of a Christian world-view on the ethos of the nation.[26] The increasing secularization of social institutions and practices, a heightened awareness of the precariousness of all claims to possess the truth, whether about religion, morals, politics, society, or education, exponential changes in patterns of material consumption, increased levels of marital breakdown - all these features of

society have had an influence on educational practice in all schools, and Catholic schools have not been exempt from such influence.[27]

The 'dissolution of boundaries of a distinctive Catholic subculture' as a side-effect of accumulated social change and ecclesial practice is especially relevant for my exploration of the tension between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education.[28] As explicit external threats to Catholicism have diminished, and as Catholics have become more accepted into national culture, it appears that more subtle and insidious challenges have arisen, both as the unforeseen price of social assimilation and as the result of a (still unfinished) thinking through and living out of a major internal reinterpretation of the nature of Catholicism. The church's understanding of the dialectic between distinctiveness and inclusiveness at any particular time is modified both by the conceptual categories available (including the intellectual adversaries encountered) and also by the challenges to Gospel-based living presented by changing social contexts.

When a distinctive approach to a religiously based form of education (one which takes place in separate schools) is linked to an exclusive approach to church membership, there are fewer demands for a sophisticated defence of distinctiveness, because there is less dialogue with those (outside the church) who hold different views. This lack of a felt need for a sophisticated defence of distinctiveness is perpetuated if the church displays an authoritarian enforcement of uniformity and strong demands for obedience in doctrinal, moral and spiritual matters, and where there is little accommodation to local cultures or to individual circumstances. It is almost as if the presence of high walls surrounding the church - keeping people in as well as ruling others out - obviates the need for the construction of the wide bridges which become necessary if there is to be encounter and intercourse on any significant scale between

'insiders' and 'outsiders'. As soon as dialogue becomes widespread - due to the combination of an increased openness to the world on the part of Catholics and a reduction of suspicion against Catholics on the part of society - then a different approach to distinctiveness is required. The current emphasis on a greater degree of inclusiveness within Catholicism generally, one which allows for some plurality as a necessary by-product of inculturation, leads to the need for a fresh understanding and a re-appropriation of distinctiveness in the particular context of education.

By moving away from a 'ghetto' mentality and entering into a (reciprocated) greater openness with people of other persuasions, Catholics have found themselves lacking an appropriate 'plausibility structure'.[29] Can they be accepted and included in society without being 'swallowed', without loss of what is essential to and distinctive in their identity? And if they seek to be inclusive in turn, within their own schools, how is this to be managed in a way that is compatible with the claim to offer a distinctive 'reading' or interpretation of life and, following from this, a distinctive approach to education? Maintaining this distinctiveness will impose some limits on the extent of inclusiveness.[30] Furthermore, if they are sensitive to the dissolution of boundaries of their own subculture, Catholic educators will be concerned that their own efforts - to include the increasing numbers of pupils (and staff) who come from other faiths or with no religious affiliation - should avoid any dominating attempt at assimilation.

The delicate task of self-preservation, balanced by maintaining an openness to others of a different persuasion, has, of course, confronted other faith communities in the past and it continues to test them. The Islamic community, which is currently asking for the same rights for separate schools as those enjoyed by, for example, Catholics and Anglicans, might find the wrestling of the Catholic community with these issues of interest and relevance as they weigh up the implications, in terms of costs,

responsibilities and relationships, of state-supported separate Muslim schools. The avoidance of dominance or assimilation is necessarily in some tension with the claim of any religion to possess the truth. This is as true for Catholic Christianity as for Islam.

I have referred to changes in the composition of Catholic schools and also in the position of the churches in society. I have already suggested that a by-product of government legislation has been the fresh impetus it has given to the task of articulating the distinctive nature of Catholic education. For the purposes of this thesis two aspects to this fresh impetus will be picked out, one negative, in the form of a sharp challenge, the other positive, in the form of an opportunity. When taken together these two aspects have caused the Catholic community to re-emphasise that the difference between state-sponsored and church-sponsored education goes well beyond simply a particular diet of religious instruction and more attention to collective worship.

First, there is the spur provided by features (or at least the consequences) of government policy which the bishops (and others concerned for the health of Catholic education) perceive as being unconducive to its flourishing. The encouragement of increased competition between schools, which was intended to act as a lever for raising standards and widening choice, has been seen by some Catholics (as well as by many others) as having effects which are detrimental to sound education, damaging to pastoral care and undermining of community spirit.[31] Moral dilemmas arise for schools about the tactics they might employ for survival in a competitive atmosphere. For example, will they be tempted to give less attention to (or even to be less ready to admit) those pupils who appear to contribute least to the schools' reputation in

examination league tables?[32] Will they be so ready to collaborate with other schools when they are encouraged to view educational provision as a competitive market?

> Competition brings the temptation to play the system to the advantage of one institution...It tends to undermine the integrity of the school as a moral society...[so that it] cease[s] to take the broader view and to feel concern for the whole service...Competition poisons the wells of community[33]

Second, there is the opportunity provided by new arrangements for school inspection.[34] Catholic diocesan authorities and many Heads of Catholic schools have tended to welcome the requirement on teachers in all schools to promote spiritual and moral development and to be inspected on this, even if their understanding of spirituality, morality and development differs in important respects from that of the government and despite the generally anti-OFSTED feeling among many teachers.[35] They have also welcomed the opportunity for Catholic schools to have a separate and parallel inspection which focuses directly on the provision of religious education, collective worship and the religious ethos of the school - all in the context of the specifically denominational aims and values.[36] This arrangement is an encouragement for those who espouse the importance and role of such schools in our society. The fact that all maintained church schools are subject, on a regular basis, to this form of inspection, the outcome of which is published immediately afterwards, injects an element of urgency into the deliberations of teachers about the denominational nature of their school and their work within it.[37] Preparation for inspection, dialogue with inspectors during the process and communication with parents and governors about the outcomes, combine to stimulate considerable discussion about the distinctive nature of church schools and the implementation of their mission.

There is the danger, however, that, by focusing too closely on how we might recognise the quality of Catholic education in the context of an inspection, an interpretation of Catholic education might be distorted. Giving a proper emphasis to evaluation is well-overdue, but an evaluation-led approach to clarifying the special character of Catholic education is not enough by itself. An inadequate philosophical underpinning of the enterprise of Catholic education opens the way to sloppy thinking, to ambiguous expression, to unclear boundaries, to uncertainties at the level of policy, to the danger of internal incoherence, to fudging 'hard' cases,[38] to capitulation either to secular take-overs or to theological imperialism.

2.3 Theological developments

Changes in the self-understanding of Catholic educators have also been brought about through theological development.[39] For almost a hundred years after the 1870 Forster Act set out to ensure the provision of universal elementary education in England and Wales a feature of Catholicism which helped to preserve the distinctiveness of that faith, nationally and internationally, was the predominance of neo-Thomist theology.[40] This ensured a certain commonality of theological language between the universal and the local church; it fostered a particular form of apologetics in the defence of the faith; and it preserved a form of intellectual discipline which was shared by clergy of all ages. It also focused attention on some intellectual concerns, to the neglect of others, being particularly exercised to demonstrate the rationality of faith, the dangers of the Enlightenment and liberal thinking and the incursions of a secular state. In defending an ecclesiology which treated the church primarily as an institution, neo-Thomist theologians paid insufficient attention to the relevance for faith of personal experience and they also failed to consider the implications of historical understanding.[41]

This stance was to be significantly altered both during and in the aftermath of the Second Vatican Council.[42] The modern world had been rejected and liberalism had been seen as threatening ecclesial truth-claims by its indifference, disguised as tolerance. This negative stance was reversed.[43] The Council gave respectability and prominence in Catholic thinking to notions of collegiality, pluralism and diversity, the social apostolate and a more inclusive attitude within the Church.[44] Its deliberations prompted a rethinking of key concepts which have a bearing on education: truth, knowledge, salvation, humanity, conversion and revelation. Important council documents were issued which re-expressed the mind of the Church with regard to its own nature and constitution, to revelation, ecumenism, the role of the laity, missions, non-Christians and religious freedom. Cumulatively these added up to a significant modification in self-understanding and in the stance to be adopted toward the world.[45] One major shift in emphasis was to encourage a more positive attitude toward the world and a greater willingness to encourage involvement with others outside the church in human struggles for justice and peace, as opposed to a stance that had been more withdrawn, isolated and tending to avoid contamination.[46]

In rapid succession Catholic theologians entered into serious dialogue with a host of thinkers from other intellectual traditions, movements and disciplines and in the process their understanding and expression of Catholicism was transformed.[47] By comparison with the earlier neo-Thomist emphasis, post Vatican II theology often displays a noticeably different style and tone: it seems less confident and certain; it relies less on logic; it is more sensitive to outside perspectives; it takes into account diversity and plurality; it is less imperialist; it adopts a historical rather than a classical mentality; it gives greater weight to cooperation and dialogue with those who are

outside the Catholic community and it brings out more clearly the social implications of gospel teaching.[48]

This has led to changing expectations of the laity in the life of the church and also, to some degree, a recognition that the experience, perspectives and contributions of women have been neglected by theologians and church authorities. Religious education in Catholic schools in the years after the Council reflected some of these changes: its central focus was not so obviously doctrinal; its tone was less dogmatic and authoritarian; it adopted more frequently a multi-dimensional approach to the study of religion; it sought more explicitly to take into account the experience and viewpoints of pupils; it was more open to criticism and questioning; it was more open to and positive about non-Catholics.

2.4 The need for clarity about distinctiveness

These theological developments, when taken together, add up to a major reinterpretation of the nature of Catholicism. This inevitably has important implications for Catholic education. I am not suggesting that the majority of Catholic teachers have assimilated this rethinking in any depth. On the contrary, for reasons that are beyond the scope of this study to demonstrate, I believe that many Catholic teachers exhibit serious gaps in their theological understanding.[49] These gaps are due to several factors: changes in the pattern of family and parish life, confusions in Catholic education in the period after the Council, (arising from an inadequate understanding of these theological developments) and the pressures of accommodating themselves to secular requirements for professional accreditation.[50]

The main lines of theological development should, however, be taken into account if a serious case is to be made for the continuation of the policy of separate Catholic schools.[51] An understanding of the nature and purpose of Catholic education is intimately connected with an understanding of the church's mission. Any development in the church's self-understanding, along the lines I have indicated above, is bound to influence how this mission is formulated. Therefore, without an understanding of these theological developments, any attempt to re-articulate the distinctive nature of Catholic education for our times is necessarily flawed. I will seek to substantiate this claim by demonstrating later (in this chapter and in chapter three) the relationship between the key principles governing Catholic education and the Catholic theology and view of human nature which underlies these principles.

In many Catholic schools one of the five annual non-teaching days, which all teachers in maintained schools are contractually obliged to work, is allocated to consideration of some aspect of Catholic ethos.[52] When account is taken of the guidance material provided by the Catholic Education Service[53] and the dioceses and the new opportunities for extended reflection on leadership and management within Catholic schools provided by Catholic Higher Education colleges,[54] it is possible to claim that there is an unprecedented level of discussion as to the distinctive nature of Catholic schools.[55] While such discussion is to be welcomed, one must be careful to distinguish the frequency with which a topic is referred to and the depth of insight achieved. The availability of relevant, clear and accessible support material, while again to be welcomed, does not guarantee its serious take-up or any prolonged engagement with it.[56]

I would also contend that the recent substantial increase in the amount of support materials provided for Catholic teachers cannot sufficiently address the need to

articulate afresh a Catholic philosophy of education, one which takes into account the challenges presented by changes in society, education and the church. The documents produced to support Catholic schools in their task are intended to be practical rather than philosophical in nature and purpose. Their primary aim is to provide guidance for governors and senior staff in schools and for diocesan officers and others who have a role to play in implementing the Catholic community's educational policy and priorities. Such documents draw upon theological sources, scriptural passages, the teachings of church councils and popes and the lengthy tradition of church provision for education. Despite the practical purpose of the documents, however, the teaching contained within them is often articulated in abstract principles and with a universality of scope which needs to be related to particular contexts and translated into more practical terms.[57] While such universal principles are necessary, nevertheless, on the admission of those who have drawn them up, they are insufficient. The next chapter will seek to identify and to analyse the key concepts for Catholic educators, to relate these to one another and to subject them to scrutiny in a way that mediates between universal principles and particular practices.

Guidance materials for practitioners produced in this country are not able at present to draw upon any lengthy or sustained local tradition of philosophical reflection on education which is rooted in a Catholic perspective yet open to and in constant dialogue with other philosophical outlooks. Despite a rich tradition of thinkers who have contributed to the articulation of a Catholic philosophy of education, for example, among others, Augustine, Aquinas, Newman, Chesterton, Maritain and Lonergan, none of these writers directly addressed the enterprise of Catholic education as currently situated, particularly in the school context. Of these, the first two lived long before the age of mass education; only Newman and Chesterton were

English (although Lonergan studied for a time in this country) and neither of these could be considered either philosophers or educators in a professional sense; in the case of the Frenchman, Maritain, and the Canadian, Lonergan, their attention, when they wrote about education, was focused on Europe and North America in the 1940s and 1950s; these constituted very different social, political, intellectual and educational environments from that of late twentieth century England and Wales.

John Henry Newman's most developed thinking on education was set in and aimed at a university context, although some of what he wrote elsewhere has continuing relevance for my attempt to develop a Catholic perspective on education.[58] I summarise Newman's thinking on Christian education and demonstrate its relevance to this thesis in 4.2. Jacques Maritain devoted a series of lectures to the topic of education from a philosophical perspective, and two chapters to a presentation of a Thomist view on education.[59] Maritain's contribution to a Catholic philosophy of education for today will be explored in 4.6. Bernard Lonergan gave a course of lectures at a summer school in 1959 which specifically addressed topics in philosophy of education.[60] But he seems to have made little effort at this point to become familiar with educational contexts and issues outside his own experience as a seminary professor and these lectures are likely to be more valuable to those interested in the development of Lonergan's thought than to those interested in philosophy of education. It is in various and disparate passages from his later works, which were not addressing educational issues at all, that one can find material which illuminates thinking on education, particularly his notion of conversion.[61] Chesterton wrote no sustained work on education, although some brief remarks of his do provide a helpful insight into the very heart of a distinctively Catholic perspective.[62]

Of all these writers Maritain contributed most to our topic, but even in his case much of what he wrote remains far removed from the kind of philosophy of education debate which has been conducted in this country since the Second World War. In the context of a liberal, increasingly pluralist, democratic society, with ever reducing social and moral consensus, we have become accustomed to employing 'thin', procedural principles and values in public educational advocacy and to leaving aside 'thicker' and more substantive principles and values for use as a private option. I believe that in the current context described above, with its elements of both challenge and opportunity for Catholic schools, there will be a welcome for a renewed emphasis on a more rigorously philosophical Catholic approach to education.[63]

Without such an approach, the credibility of the church's witness in professional educational circles might be undermined by restricting discussion to the repetition of pious statements, which operate only at the level of rhetoric but which neither describe nor influence reality. Discussion internal to Catholic schools about their distinctiveness might lead to demoralisation of staff who feel that platitudes are uttered and perfection aspired to but that clarity about attainable goals is in short supply. Ecumenical cooperation might be put in jeopardy if the similarities and differences between the Christian churches in their approaches to and perspectives on education are not recognised, appreciated or taken into account.[64]

In this context, without a sound appreciation of the foundations of (each relevant party's respective) distinctiveness, superficial dialogue runs the risk of fixing attention on the lowest common denominator. Dialogue between Christians and people of other faiths could be severely weakened if Catholic teachers are not equipped to bring a distinctive contribution to that dialogue. In this respect uncertainty and lack of clarity are as disabling and open to misinterpretation as closed-mindedness. Both a

discerning confrontation and an appropriate cooperation with secular approaches to education are rendered extremely difficult and unlikely without serious philosophical engagement on the part of (at least some representatives from) the Catholic community. Greater clarity about their own educational philosophy among Catholics should enable them to contribute constructively to the debate about education within the wider community.

It should not be assumed in advance that the outcome of a greater clarity about a Catholic approach to education will necessarily be welcomed on all sides within Catholic schools. One of the advantages of a blurring of boundaries and a proliferation of interpretations of Catholic education is the easing of social intercourse and relationships, among staff and with pupils, stemming from the avoidance of confrontation over value clashes.[65] Another is the fudging of difficult issues referred to earlier in this chapter. As John Haldane says, "it is likely that a defensible account (of Catholic education) will be as challenging as it may be reassuring."[66] The perception of an element of "strangeness" within - and therefore possibly a sense of alienation from - Catholicism may be felt more strongly once there has been progress in elucidating its distinctive perspective on education. Any vision with the capacity to inspire and guide practice in a comprehensive way is likely at the same time to be powerful enough to render some people uncomfortable. This might well include, although for different reasons in each case, pupils, parents, teachers, parishioners and politicians, as well as clergy and their bishops.

2.5 Types of distinctiveness

As a preliminary step towards getting a sharper focus on the key concepts within Catholic education, let me clarify what will not be explored here. I shall not be

dealing with Catholic theology as a whole, nor with those aspects which are sometimes picked out as distinctive of Catholicism within the wider family of Christianity, for example, the role of the papacy, veneration for Mary, belief about purgatory, or the theories about real presence of Christ in the Eucharist,[67] nor with specific moral teachings, devotions and disciplines, relating, for example, to contraception, clerical celibacy, or the sacramental practice of confession.

These aspects may well mark out ways in which Catholic religious life differs from other forms of religious life. However, what is distinctive to a tradition and what is essential to it are not necessarily identical: elements within a tradition can be essential without being distinctive; they can also be distinctive without being essential.[68] There are two senses of distinctiveness being referred to here. The first is concerned to stress the specific nature and source of a belief or a practice: it clearly belongs integrally to and plays a special role in a particular tradition. The second refers to the uniqueness of a belief or practice, being concerned to stress that it belongs exclusively to that tradition, that it is not shared with others. I am more concerned here with the first of these two senses of distinctive.

I contend that the aspects of Catholicism listed above do not serve as foundational, constitutive and organising principles for Catholic education in the same way as those elements which I focus on later in this chapter.[69] Furthermore, to focus on those features which separate Catholics from others is to seek distinctiveness by exclusion, by emphasising what others do not believe or do not practise.[70] In contrast, I argue that the essential principles underlying a Catholic philosophy of education constitute a mode of distinctiveness with the power to be inclusive.[71]

My analysis of the distinctiveness of Catholic education does not therefore entail picking out elements which are not shared by other Christian traditions.[72] Much that Catholics hold as of central importance in education is accepted by others.[73] It will be suggested that the distinctiveness of Catholic schools rests not so much upon special building blocks, each of which is peculiar to Catholicism, as upon a particular configuration of characteristics, which mesh and interlock with one another.[74] Perhaps a helpful analogy is to hear these elements as notes in a symphony rather than as bricks in a building.[75] The analogy highlights the fact that the ultimate constituents of a symphony are both the notes and their relations. In a piece of music sounds are not heard in isolation from one another; rather we 'co-hear' them in the auditory atmosphere of their mutual interrelationships and reciprocal resonance. What must be identified are those beliefs and concepts which are architectonic and integrative, which unify what might otherwise be disparate elements, those which provide direction, order and purpose for Catholic education, those which give to teachers a sense of its point and its importance.[76]

Something of what I am striving for is conveyed by the term 'economy', as used by Newman.[77] Newman's treatment of the term 'economy' embraces several meanings, including the shape, balance and interconnectedness of doctrine, the inadequacy of religious language to its object, and the cautious (and pedagogically prudent) unveiling of truth to believers, so that they can cope with it according to their intellectual capacity and moral maturity. To reflect on the 'economy' of Catholic theology or to enquire about the 'economy' of Catholic educational principles is to look for a pattern of relationships and exchanges in an interconnecting set of ideas which displays wholeness and balance. Originally referring to the organization of a household, 'economy,' in the sense employed by Newman, implies something which cannot be exactly specified or laid out for inspection by an autonomous rationality. Within the

'economy' there lie precious truths or 'treasures' which can reflect God's presence. In order to benefit from this treasure, we are expected, in communion with the Church, to live by these truths, rather than to dissect them in a detached, objective and individualistic manner. Any knowledge we have remains at the tacit level and it resists attempts to make it too explicit. Our understanding at any particular moment is bound to be imperfect, yielding only a shadow rather than the substance of God's reality.

Despite this caveat, I think it will be helpful here to offer a preliminary (and exceedingly economic!) outline of a Catholic approach to education. The purpose of this personal summary is merely to orient the reader to my provision of a more detailed analysis of Catholic self-understanding and a review of the major documents and key principles which govern Catholic education. It is also intended to anticipate the more extended outline (offered in chapter four) of the worldview on which the Catholic approach to education is based. It does not purport to be an authoritative representation of the Catholic tradition.

2.6 A personal summary of a Catholic view of education

If asked to summarise, from a perspective informed by faith, his or her approach to education, a Catholic might reply in the following way. God's authority as our creator and redeemer, as our source and our final goal, is to be recognised. Jesus the Christ revealed to us true humanity and divinity, embodied a pattern for worthwhile living and offers us a personal relationship which is salvific. God's Holy Spirit is constantly available to us all in every circumstance of life as presence and power. We are called to enter into union with Christ, through accepting the presence of the Spirit, through prayer, conversion of lifestyle from one currently ruled by sin into one modelled for us by Jesus in the Gospel.

All truth comes ultimately to us from God, whatever its mode of mediation. Part of coming to appreciate creation is to learn to see the interconnectedness of all reality. This entails developing a holistic, rather than a partial or fragmented outlook. We do not attain this outlook in isolation but in the context of experiencing life in community. Education is to be carried out within a harmonious relationship with the living tradition of the Church, (which is founded to carry on Christ's mission and to convey his word), in partnership with parents, who are our first and most important educators and in recognition of an objective moral law which we disobey only at the cost of personal diminishment and social (and ecological) destruction. Education should be recognised as an invitation to continuous conversion into a more Christ-like personality, to personal holiness and to social transformation. This will entail development of the whole person in all dimensions, physical, intellectual, social, aesthetic, emotional, vocational, moral and spiritual, so that by learning, growth, development and sacrifice (literally, 'making holy' the substance of our lives) we shall be ready to enjoy eternal life with God and in communion with others.

2.7 Key features of Catholicism

This outline suggests significant differences of emphasis from secular and liberal approaches to education; it does not identify what is distinctive about a specifically Catholic as opposed to a more generally Christian approach.[78] Richard McBrien argues that it is the prominence given to the Petrine ministry of the papacy as an integral institutional element in the church's self-understanding of itself, which most clearly distinguishes that church from all Christian churches.[79] Catholic doctrinal and disciplinary traditions relating to the nature of the church appear to be the locus of the principal differences between Catholics and other Christians. Using the analogy of

the flag of the United States of America, which is tri-coloured, a feature shared with the flags of many other countries, specifically red, white and blue, a feature also shared by the flags of many other countries, and with stars, a feature similarly displayed on flags from several countries, McBrien points out that "what is *distinctive* about the United States' flag is not any of its several *characteristics* but the precise *configuration* of those characteristics. So, too, with the Catholic Church in relation to all of the other churches and traditions within the Body of Christ."[80] I do not claim that this reference to 'configuration' adequately establishes the distinctiveness of Catholicism. That requires a more elaborate specification of the characteristics integral to this faith. McBrien's emphasis does, however, serve to remind us that particular elements should not simply be seen in isolation from one another. It is necessary to understand the way they interlock, modify and reinforce each other.[81] The precise configuration will also be affected by both historical and cultural changes. That is, the articulation of the distinctiveness of Catholicism at any particular time and place cannot help but be influenced by the conceptual categories, questions, assumptions and perspectives of those who are addressed.

A key feature in Catholic self-understanding is the universality of the Church, a quality contrasted with sectarian and reductionist tendencies. This suggests a high degree of openness to all truth (as coming from God) and a comprehensive (as compared to a partial or not fully rounded) embrace of all aspects of Christian experience. McBrien brings this out by stressing the *both/and* nature of Catholicism (as compared with an either/or approach) : "graced nature, reason illumined by faith, law inspired by the Gospel, tradition within Scripture, faith issuing in works, authority in the service of freedom, unity in diversity."[82] It is the combination of elements, rather than an emphasis on one pole being opposed to the other in each polarity which characterises Catholicism. It is part of the very nature of the Church that it is pluralist,

ecumenical, open to new life and to new discernment of truth, since the Holy Spirit continues to call all its members into the fullness of truth, a state which is a task and an aspiration rather than a possession or an achievement. It is also part of the very nature of the Church to be concerned with the preservation of identity, stability and tradition, and the teaching of an authoritative revelation already received. These two aspects of the Church mutually qualify and complete each other.

McBrien stresses three particular principles within Catholicism, which, taken together, he claims, bring us to the very heart of that faith. These are sacramentality, mediation and communion. The sacramental perspective looks out for God everywhere since all reality is saved; it sees the divine in the human, the infinite in the finite, the spiritual in the material, the transcendent in the immanent and the eternal in the historical. God is to be found in all things: other people, communities, movements, events, places, the world at large, the whole cosmos. From this perspective the visible, the tangible, the finite, the historical are all actual or potential carriers of the divine presence.[83]

Closely connected to acceptance of sacramentality is the notion of mediation. Here the claim is that "created realities not only contain, reflect or embody the presence of God, they make that presence spiritually effective for those who avail themselves of the sacred realities. Our encounter with God is a mediated experience".[84] By spiritual effectiveness McBrien means that we find ourselves changed in a positive way through each of our encounters; through them we are healed, transformed and renewed.[85]

The emphasis on communion reminds us that we are radically social beings, that we meet God through the mediation of a community of faith, not in isolation from one another, despite what some mystics might claim, and no matter how deep is our

personal relationship with God.[86] Individualism and excessive claims for autonomy are seen as antagonistic to this notion of communion and community.[87]

All three principles are open to distortion and abuse. Sacramentality can slide into idolatry, mediation into magic and communion into authoritarianism.[88] Avery Dulles, in his study *The Catholicity of the Church*, also points out the dangerous extremes to which Catholicism has sometimes been liable and from which it needs correction. Among these errors he includes triumphalism, clericalism, juridicism, papalism, dogmatism and ritualism.[89] Triumphalism displays an arrogance about the superiority of the Catholic church over all others and proclaims its inevitable triumph over all adversity and opposition. Clericalism exaggerates the differences between the ministerial priesthood and the priesthood of all believers and divides the church into first-class citizens, the clergy and second-class citizens, the laity. Juridicism exalts the place of law within the church, reduces morality to obedience and obscures both the gratuity of the Gospel (which comes to us as a gift and cannot be earned) and the freedom it offers. In similar fashion, papalism, dogmatism and ritualism exaggerate respectively the importance and role of the Pope, of the exact and uniform expression of doctrine and of precise rules for liturgy, each of which has a legitimate place in the overall 'economy' of the church.

Behind many of these errors or distortions there lies what we might call the shadow side of the positive insights of Catholicism.[90] If God's presence to us through creation is emphasised too strongly, so that God appears close, available, intimate and immanent, perhaps God's transcendence and the distinction between God and creation is insufficiently emphasized, thereby allowing the finite and the imperfect to be attributed divine status.[91] We live between the inauguration of God's kingdom, already begun at Calvary, and its final consummation at the Parousia or end of time,

between the 'already' and the 'not-yet.' Although we can be assured of God's presence in our lives and confident that God's kingdom, with its grace and its offer of forgiveness and healing, has already broken into our world, we should not prematurely act as though this kingdom is fully established, nor should we assume that we have, through the Church, already arrived at our heavenly destination, so that further conversion and change, personal, institutional and social, is no longer necessary. We must always be ready to be led further into truth and to be open to new aspects of God's teaching. This means that we should avoid canonizing either the past or the present and that we should not equate continuity with immutability.[92]

Part of this openness to the future within the Catholic tradition relates to the consciousness of death as a gateway to eternal life. It has been said that "the quintessential left by a Catholic education is a lasting consciousness of the fact and meaning of death."[93] The statement is not meant to induce a morbid approach to life. We discover what lasts and what offers true life in the process of learning to die to self in countless small ways and as we are freed from a grasping possessiveness with regard to the good things we experience. There is little evidence that Catholic schools in recent years have given much emphasis to preparing pupils for death. Perhaps this partly stems from a reaction which has taken place since Vatican II against a previous world-denying and somewhat puritanical style of Catholicism. However,

> Vatican II did not simply try to *balance* our concern for this world and our concern for the world to come;...the hope of heaven should *animate and purify* our attempts to cherish humanity. ...We view our present life wrongly if, in the light of Heaven, we treat it as of no value at all; or if we cling frantically to pleasures that are only meant to be transitory; or if we suppose that this life is our only life, a journey into nothingness and not into light.[94]

One of the ways to understand better that a 'healthy awareness of death' is not a contradiction in terms and that self-denial and affirmation of the world go together, even require one another, is through a deeper exploration of human nature in the light of the Incarnation. This will show that a growth in our understanding of the relationship between the human and the divine has repercussions elsewhere in our thinking. I explore connections between an understanding of human and divine nature (in the light of belief in the Incarnation) in 4.5, below. First, however, I intend to analyse and comment on the Church's teaching on education from Vatican II onwards. This teaching has a more conciliatory tone towards the world and dissolves any notion of a schism between the natural and the supernatural.[95]

In this chapter I have provided a particular context for my theoretical examination of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education. Some of the factors influencing change and re-thinking about Catholic education relate specifically to the context of England and Wales, while others emerge from theological developments at an international level. Catholic schools in this country face challenges and opportunities stemming from the specific historical, social, political and educational situation here, but they also draw many of their foundational principles from the world-wide church. In the following chapter I analyse the major authoritative resources provided by the church for Catholic schools as they reflect on their rationale, priorities and guiding principles.

Notes and references for chapter two

[1]James Arthur, *The Ebbing Tide*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1995, p.15. quotes from a resolution of bishops from the Westminster Province in 1852 as evidence that this preference was formal policy.

[2]By 1996 the Catholic community was paying about £20 million annually in support of its denominational schools. See Catholic Education Service, *Education in Catholic Schools and Colleges : Principles, Practices and Concerns*, (Manchester, Gabriel Communications, 1996), p.2. Although these costs are still very high, it must be borne in mind first, that a much higher level of government grant is now available than was the case in the nineteenth century and during the first half of the twentieth century and, second, that the Catholic community is, as a whole, much less burdened by poverty than it was a century ago.

[3]In the rulings of Canon Law earlier this century canon 1374 said that Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic schools. Canon 2319 laid down an automatic excommunication for parents who knowingly and willingly arrange for their children to be educated in a non-Catholic religion...and also for those who marry with a pact...for the non-Catholic education of their children. See Michael Gaine, 'Roman Catholic Educational Policy', in *Religious Education : Drift or Decision?*, edited by Philip Jebb, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1968, p.138.

[4]Michael Hornsby-Smith, 'Transformations in English Catholicism : Evidence of Secularization?', in *Religion and Modernization*, edited by Steve Bruce, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992, p.125. refers to the pre-Vatican II years of ultramontane leadership...stress on obedience...distinctive norms of marital, sexual and familial morality...unique sense of identity and separateness fostered by peculiarly Roman Catholic practices such as the retention of Latin in the liturgy and Friday abstinence [and then contrasts this with] the heterogeneity of religious beliefs and practices of English Catholics [which] was demonstrated by the 1978 national survey [of Roman Catholics, which he carried out]. He observes (p.131.) that "up to the 1950s Catholics differentiated relatively little between creedal beliefs, non-creedal beliefs such as papal infallibility, teachings on moral issues (especially those dealing with personal sexuality, such as contraception), and disciplinary rules (such as the mass attendance obligation, the prohibition of intercommunion or the frequency of confession)."

[5]See section 2.3 for a summary of developments within Catholicism brought about by this Council.

[6]See note 3.

[7]McLaughlin, O'Keeffe and O'Keefe point out that "by the end of the mid 1960s only 60% of Catholic children had access to a Catholic school." *The Contemporary Catholic School*, (hereafter, *CCS*) London, Falmer Press, 1996, p.6. This is not solely due to insufficient or uneven provision. They cite "greater social mobility, a

lessening of deference in the face of authority and an enlargement of horizons" as having a bearing on the level of parental support for Catholic schooling. *(ibid.)*

[8]I refer to some of these statements below.

[9]The respective remit of these bodies is not always clear to the schools they are meant to support. Differences in emphasis and poor communication between them are not unknown in some dioceses.

[10]For example, there are schools owned and run by the (male) Jesuits and Benedictines and the Notre Dame and the Ursuline Sisters. Some schools owned by religious orders are in the independent sector and others in the maintained sector. Some members of religious orders also work in (either independent or maintained) Catholic schools, which are not owned by their order. The position is made even more complex by the fact that some of the religious orders responsible for Catholic schools in England and Wales are based overseas. Gerald Grace refers to the contribution of religious orders to Catholic education as a form of 'strategic subsidy'. See his chapter 'The Future of the Catholic School : An English Perspective' in *From Ideal to Action*, edited by Matthew Feheney, Veritas, Dublin, 1998, pp.193, 245-6. The Catholic community would benefit from further research into the substantial contribution of different religious orders to education.

[11]I have known situations where locally elected governors have been overruled in school policy decisions by trustees from another country. Just as foundation governors who do not comply with their bishop's requirements in upholding Catholic education can be replaced, so also can representatives of trustees who fail to implement the policy of their 'mother' body.

[12]See James Arthur (1995), *op.cit.*, p.153 on increased tension between the parental and episcopal poles of authority.

[13]With varying combinations of state and private funding and control, as well as allowing each school more scope to maximise its special contribution or place in a market of educational providers and encouraging a more entrepreneurial and competitive spirit between schools.

[14]At the time of writing there are 128 (out of 2450) Catholic schools which have opted for Grant Maintained status, in some cases with the blessing of their diocese, in some cases in defiance of it. (The system is again being modified in 1998.) The 17 Catholic sixth form colleges have been subject to a very different regime of funding, control and inspection since 1992, one which makes the promotion of their Catholic ethos harder to maintain than when their status was the same as voluntary aided schools. One Catholic sixth form college (De La Salle) closed after an unsatisfactory (Further Education Funding Council) inspection report. Another (St Philip's) was closed after protracted and painful internal debate about its Catholic nature and its multi-faith student intake. This particular episode proved extremely controversial among the wider Catholic community because the development of the arguments represented a clash between apparently incompatible models for Catholic education. It might be argued that the college's closure represented a victory for an exclusivist, closed, elitist, unquestioning, inward-looking and defensive form of Catholicism. An alternative view might be that the trustees finally woke up to, and took a courageous,

if unpopular, stand against, the effects of a creeping secularisation and a corrosive liberalism within Catholic education itself. See especially two articles in *The Tablet*: 'The Battle for St Philip's', (10th October, 1992), pp.1261-2, by Michael Walsh and 'Shades of the Ghetto', (7th November, 1992), pp.1396-7, by Gerry Hughes; and also Vince Murray's chapter 'Other Faiths in Catholic Schools' in *CCS*.

[15]To adopt the 'market' language expressed by the 1992 government White Paper *Choice and Diversity*.

[16]A complaint made against the predominant comprehensive school system was that it emphasised the similarities between schools, leading to a bland uniformity, reducing parental choice and giving too much power to professional providers rather than to the 'consumers'.

[17]This is mediated through national guidelines and by diocesan and other authorities and advisers; it will meet with varying degrees of understanding and support from teachers in Catholic schools. See chapter three for a detailed analysis of the key constituents of this Catholic educational philosophy. See Appendix 1 for an extended treatment of some problems arising from attempts to uphold Catholic ethos with staff who do not hold to such a philosophy and who do not adhere to its injunctions.

[18]Arthur (*op.cit.*, p.48) refers to the distinction in the Church's understanding of education between primary and secondary aims. "Primary aims are constants, grounded in revealed truths about our nature, our origin, and our destiny. Secondary aims are variables and involve educational theories, methods of teaching, administration and other techniques. Secondary aims reflect the changing conditions of society, while primary aims are unchanging and independent of social conditions. Primary aims are normative rather than descriptive, since they express, not a pragmatic conception of how things actually are, but a vision of what is intended to be." Arthur borrows this distinction from J. Redden and F. Ryan, *A Catholic Philosophy of Education*, Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956. In between the primary aims, which I examine in chapter four, and the secondary aims listed (above) by Arthur, there are also to be taken into account key principles which govern the practice of Catholic education. These are secondary insofar as they are subordinate to and flow from the primary beliefs but they have priority over the secondary aims as described by Arthur. I provide my own analysis and interpretation of what I take to be these key principles later in chapter three. It could be said that they mediate between the more overarching religious beliefs (with an accompanying theological interpretation) and the specific decisions about secondary aims. For a brief summary of these key principles, which offers an alternative, but not conflicting, version from my own interpretation, see note 73, below.

[19]See *General Directory for Catechesis*, issued from Rome by the Congregation for the Clergy, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1997, pp. 212, 246, 276. There is even an encouragement in this document for the teacher to "acquire his *(sic)* own style of imparting catechesis by adapting the general principles of catechetical pedagogy to his own personality" and a prompt to be "creative in formation and not just applying external rules." (*ibid.*, p.252)

[20]Bernadette O'Keeffe, 'Catholic Education in an Open Society : the English Challenge' in *The Catholic School and the European Context*, edited by V.A. McClelland, Hull University, Aspects of Education, Number 46, p.43, 1992. She describes (pp.43-45) several models of Catholic schooling: the 'bedrock', joint school, minimal risk, urban, and inter-faith Catholic school. O'Keeffe has updated this essay in her chapter, 'The Changing Role of Catholic Schools in England and Wales : From Exclusiveness to Engagement', in *Leading the Catholic School*, edited by John McMahon, Helga Neidhart & Judith Chapman, Richmond Virginia, Australia, Spectrum Publications, 1997.

[21]Limitations of space prevent me from exploring here issues arising from posing the interesting questions: 'what, if anything, makes a particular (Catholic) school unique?' and 'what, if anything, makes it Catholic in a special way?' Anneke de Wolff points out that, in British, American and European discussions about the identity of Christian schools, of whatever denomination, such identity has been treated as a group phenomenon. Much more emphasis has been given to how they (jointly) differ from non-Christian schools as compared with how they differ among themselves. 'The Identity of Christian Schools', unpublished paper presented at the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1997, pp.1-2. She also observes that the changeability or dynamic nature of the identity of Christian schools is neglected in studies of Christian schools because concern about their identity, being closely linked with concern about the continuity of the tradition, is seen in static terms.

[22]Hornsby-Smith, *op.cit.*, p.136. says there were "202 secular clergy in Catholic schools in 1964; in 1988 there were 26.

[23]Bernadette O'Keeffe, 'Catholic Schools in an Open Society : the English Challenge', *The Catholic School and the European Context*, edited by V.A. McClelland, Aspects of Education, No.46, Hull University, 1992, p.41. :"At the beginning of the 1960s, most Catholic schools still had priests or Religious as headteachers. By the end of the 1970s almost all day schools had lay headteachers."

[24]Robert Dent, *Faith of Our Fathers : Roman Catholic Schools in a Multi-Faith Society*, Coventry Education Department, 1992, p.16. refers to the national average of non-Catholic staff in Catholic schools being 10% in the primary and 30% in the secondary sector. O'Keeffe, (1992, *loc.cit.* claims that "[t]he number of non-Catholic teachers in primary schools has almost doubled (10%) in the last ten years." She gives a figure for non-Catholic teachers in secondary schools as 26.6% in 1991. O'Keeffe also gives figures showing the rise in number of non-Catholic pupils, especially emphasising that in some areas Catholic schools have many pupils from other faiths. cf. McLaughlin, O'Keefe and O'Keeffe, *CCS*, p.13., quoting from (1994) Catholic Education Service figures, were able to demonstrate that there continued to be a steady increase in the number of non-Catholic teachers, reaching 12.1% in Catholic primary and 41.1% in Catholic secondary schools. They show that this also applies to pupils, with 10.6% in primary and 16.1% in secondary being non-Catholic. Later figures, from the Catholic Education Service Newsletter no. 9, summer 1996, p.1. show 89% of pupils in RC primary schools are Catholics and that in secondary schools the parallel figure is 83%. The comment is added: "these

averages conceal a wide range across the dioceses of the total intake of Catholic pupils. In Liverpool, just over 96%, in Hallam the total is just under 70%." The figures also obscure the varying degree of commitment to the faith shown by both staff and pupils who nominate themselves as Catholic.

[25]Ungoed-Thomas, 'Vision, Values and Virtues' in *Values in Education and Education in Values*, edited by M.Halstead and M.Taylor, London, Falmer Press, 1996, p.144. brings out the intimate connection between religion and education in the public mind. "For many generations in England it was usual to understand what a school was by reference to religious institutions...Teachers were frequently ordained, much of the curriculum was concerned with theological matters, and the chapel was a focal point of school life. Indeed, many schools were almost indistinguishable in appearance from religious houses, with their places of prayer, cloisters, dorters or dormitories, closes, kitchens, fraters or dining halls, libraries,[etc]...it was not always easy to distinguish at first sight a theological college, a seminary or a novice house from a simple school." For a brief review of the changing relationship (in the 1980s and 1990s) of church and state over education in England and Wales, see Nicholas Pyke, 'The Churches recover their voice', *The Tablet*, 24th May 1997, pp.662-4. For an extended survey, covering the nineteenth century origins of the 'dual system' and taking the picture up to 1997, see Priscilla Chadwick, *Shifting Alliances*, London, Cassell, 1997.

[26]Grace Davie, *Religion in Britain Since 1945 : Believing Without Belonging*, Oxford, Blackwell 1994; Catholics have also been affected by this trend, although less dramatically. See the studies by Michael Hornsby-Smith, (1987), *Roman Catholics in England : Studies in Social Structure since the Second World War*, and (1991) *Roman Catholic beliefs in England : Customary Catholicism and transformation of religious authority*, both Cambridge University Press. In his essay 'Transformations in English Catholicism : Evidence of Secularization?', (in *Religion and Modernization*, edited by Steve Bruce, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992) Hornsby-Smith refers (pp.137-8.) to the decline in Mass attendance, the virtual disappearance of benediction, the reduction in the number of priests and the decline in the frequency of confession. However, he also notes areas of growth, as well as decline, in the development and expression of English Catholicism, for example, with regard to lay participation, group prayer, scripture reading, ecumenism and social action for justice and peace. (pp.122, 123, 137, 138.)

[27]For two major studies which explore the effects of changes in the wider society on the self-understanding of late twentieth century English Catholicism, see Anthony Archer, *The Two Catholic Churches*, London, SCM, 1986 and Desmond Ryan, *The Catholic Parish*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1996.

[28]Hornsby-Smith (1992), *loc. cit.*, p.128.

[29]For an analysis and employment of the notion of 'plausibility structures' which legitimate and provide support for a worldview or way of thinking, see the works of Peter Berger : *The Sacred Canopy*, New York, Doubleday, 1969; *A Rumour of Angels*, (1970) and *The Social Construction of Reality*, (1971) both London,

Penguin; *The Homeless Mind*, (with Brigitte Berger and Hansfried Kellner), London, Penguin, 1974; *The Heretical Imperative*, London, Collins, 1980.

[30]See chapter five for an examination of the limits of inclusiveness in Catholic schools.

[31]See, for example, the comment by O'Keeffe and O'Keefe in *CCS*, p.306. : "The competitive climate in which Catholic schools function places self-interest, competition, success and the power of personal choice high on the agenda." For the value clashes and moral dilemmas thrown up by recent government legislation see Grace, G, *School Leadership* (London, Falmer Press, 1995), Ball, S, *Education Reform : A Critical and Post-Structural Approach*, (Milton Keynes, Open University Press, 1994), Ranson, S, *Towards the Learning Society* (London, Cassell, 1994), Ranson, S and Stewart, J, *Management for the Public Domain* (Basingstoke, Macmillan Press, 1994) and *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1994. Complaints levelled at government policy, apart from the deficiencies of a market-led approach to provision and the dangers of competition, include the narrow focus on education for economic needs, the weakening of local education authorities and the increase in state control. See chapter one, notes 5 - 8. On the concern that Catholic schools are deflected from the transmission of Catholic culture by their accommodation of pressures for results set by the state, see Christopher Dawson, *The Crisis of Western Education*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1961, p.111.

[32]According to Nicholas Pyke, "schools no longer have time to concentrate on the vulnerable." ('Young minds in trouble', *The Tablet*, 15th February, 1997, p.211) On this point, see also Gerald Grace, 'The Future of Catholic Schools', in *From Ideal to Action*, p.195.

[33]John Prangley, 'Examination factories', *The Tablet*, 15th February, 1997, p.208. Prangley warns that the "subtler, deeper purposes and goals of schools are not easy to determine in an objective way and so now tend to be neglected in the classroom and in governors' meetings." He refers (p.207) to the "relative neglect of the children with special needs, at both ends of the ability scale, as their performances cannot be so significantly changed" [as those on the borderline of a pass].

[34]The introduction in 1993 of a new national system of inspection has forced all schools to review their progress towards providing high quality teaching, high standards of pupil achievement, effective opportunities for spiritual, moral, social and cultural development and value for money in the use of resources. After the disbanding of Her Majesty's Inspectorate, inspections are now carried out under the aegis of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED).

[35]The following comment brings out a key difference: "Although both the National Curriculum Council and OFSTED make it clear that spiritual and moral development do not necessarily depend on religious belief, in the Catholic synthesis of the human and the divine they must." *Spiritual and Moral Development Across the Curriculum*, Catholic Education Service, 1995, p.3. See chapter four for an analysis of a Catholic perspective on human nature and development.

[36]This form of inspection, called a Section 23 (formerly Section 13) inspection, is also available for Anglican and Jewish schools. Of course such communities, along with the Catholic community, have always had the right to inspect their own schools. Now state funding, albeit at a very low level, is available for these religious inspections, with the minimum of strings attached. Control over the content and conduct of these inspections remains with the respective religious communities.

[37]For many years prior to the present arrangement, religious inspections of Catholic schools were carried out in a patchy way, with little evidence of regularity, consistency or rigour. Reports were not published. Criteria for such inspections were unclear. No training for this kind of inspection was provided. Rarely were teachers other than Religious Education staff observed in action. Now the criteria for inspection, both OFSTED and also religious inspection, have been made available at a level of detail and documentation hitherto never experienced. Some obscurity remains about the criteria for spiritual and moral development in county schools, but the Catholic community has responded to the new situation by seeking (through its Board of Religious Inspectors and Advisers) much greater levels of rigour and consistency in religious inspections. The Catholic Education Service and the dioceses have drawn up (sometimes very substantial) guidelines for the content and conduct of these inspections. I believe that there is a degree of transparency, rigour, professionalism and practicality about such documents which goes well beyond previous guidelines for identifying the distinctiveness of Catholic schools. Openness about such criteria has been commended and appreciated, even if the resulting paperwork is often felt to be excessive. A religious inspection under current arrangements takes place every four years and is a major event in the life of the school, for the ensuing report will almost definitely affect public perceptions of the school, and therefore its pupil intake (and thereby staff job security).

[38]These might relate to questions about the composition of pupil admissions, for example, what percentage can come from non-Catholic families without detriment to the Catholic character of a school?; to staff appointments and promotions - are non-Catholic staff to be considered second-class citizens in terms of the ideal to be aimed for?, and should all senior positions be held by Catholic staff?; what are the criteria for establishing who is a Catholic? (and who applies these criteria?). There are many other controversial issues to be addressed, including, for example, appropriate lifestyle for teachers, if they are considered as models for pupils, school behaviour policies which are congruent with aims and mission, grounds for advocating pupil exclusions, criteria for making decisions over school budgets and priorities and so on.

[39]I share John Courtney Murray's presupposition: "Christian theology is the architectonic science that furnishes the basic postulates of the theory of Christian education, specifies its objectives, invests the whole process with a distinctive atmosphere, and gives unity and hence intelligibility to its concrete programme. In a word, I assume that Christian theology gives to Christian education what Newman would call its 'idea'." (*Bridging the Sacred and the Secular: Selected Writings of John Courtney Murray,* edited by Leon Hooper, Washington DC, Georgetown University Press, 1994, p.124.) This assumption is vigorously rejected by James Michael Lee who, in his perfectly valid advocacy of the centrality of the social

sciences in reaching an adequate understanding of educational processes, in my view unfortunately overstates his criticisms of those who give priority to theology in seeking to understand what is at stake in Christian education and the ends to which it should be directed. See 'Religious education and theology', in *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation*, edited by Jeff Astley, Leslie Francis and Colin Crowder, Leominster, Gracewing, 1996, pp.45-68.

[40]From being one style of theology competing for attention alongside several others within Catholicism, neo-Thomism, which is an adaptation of the thought of (the thirteenth century philosopher and theologian) Thomas Aquinas, was elevated into pole position, made normative for all clerical intellectual formation and fervently advocated as an eternally essential foundation and the sole valid medium for the expression of Catholicism by Pope Leo XIII, for example in his (1879) encyclical *Aeterni Patris*. An authoritative analyst of the nature, influence and changing fortunes of neo-Thomism is Gerald McCool. See his two studies, *Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century : The Quest for a Unitary Method*, New York, Seabury Press, 1977; and *From Unity to Pluralism*, New York, Fordham University Press, 1992.

[41]As was demonstrated in the ferociously negative Roman response (the decree *Lamentabili Sane Exitu*, the encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (both 1907), increased censorship, the anti-modernist oath and the vigilance committees) to the challenges posed in the early years of this century by 'modernist' thinkers such as the French biblical and historical scholar Alfred Loisy (1857-1940) and the Anglo-Irish theologian and spiritual director George Tyrrell (1861-1909).

[42]Two books which examine at length the nature and depths of (as well as some of the unresolved ambiguities brought about by) the shift in stance adopted at Vatican II, especially in the relationship between Catholicism and liberalism, are Gene Burns, *The Frontiers of Catholicism*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1992, chapters two and three; and R. Bruce Douglass and David Hollenbach (eds), *Catholicism and Liberalism*, Cambridge University Press, 1994, chapter three.

[43]Dermot Lane summarises the shift in stance as one that displayed : "the ecclesial recognition of other Churches, respect for the value of non-Christian religions, the affirmation of the principle of religious freedom, the acknowledgement of the importance of human rights and social justice, the endorsement of a 'new humanism', and a real concern for the salvation of the world." (*Religion and Culture in Dialogue*, edited by D. Lane, Dublin, Columba Press, 1993, p.16.)

[44]For instance, it moved away from considering the church as being simply coextensive with the Catholic Church, or as identical with the Body of Christ, or even more narrowly, as something to be equated with the hierarchy. Richard McBrien, 'Before and After Vatican II', *Priests and People*, August-September 1996, pp.297-302, at pp.297-298.

[45]Bruno Brinkman suggests that "those who have interiorized Vatican II values find themselves at loggerheads at least intellectually with those who have become restorationists in favour of the status quo ante," and he identifies eight major points of tension: " (1) individual leadership versus the doctrine and desire to see the Church as

the People of God; (2) a general and universal leadership as against the leadership types of local cultures; (3) the issue of salvation within and without the Catholic Church; (4) the polarity between the timeless and placeless heaven as a personal inspiration which may vie with the struggle for justice very much in the midst of this world; (5) the old question of biblical supremacy on the one side and the authority of Church tradition on the other; (6) the Church priesthood being on the one hand a priesthood of all believers in the Church, and on the other side the priesthood historically understood, as we know it, of only a selected class, all male; (7) a liturgy which reflects the ancient culture of the West, and the need for liturgies that reflect a variety of cultures; (8) a consecration to God in human lives which have fled the world, over against a form of prophetic witness to be lived within the world where it is most needed." ('Due Veduta di Roma', in *The Heythrop Journal* vol.37, no.2, April 1996, pp.187-8.)

[46]In tracing the changes brought about by Vatican II, Richard McBrien observes : "Preconciliar Catholicism tended to limit the essential, or constitutive, mission of the Church to preaching, teaching catechesis, and worship (understood as the whole sacramental life). Ecclesial engagement with the wider world through ministries of justice and peace, for example, was regarded as only antecedent or preparatory to the essential mission of the Church. A sharp distinction, therefore, was maintained between the sacred and the secular orders." ('Before and After Vatican II', *Priests and People*, August-September, 1996, p.299.

[47]Debate ensued with existentialists, Marxists and feminists. The categories and perspectives of sociology and psychology were welcomed for the light they cast on the genesis and development of religious ideas and the functioning of religious bodies. New understandings of 'wholeness' and spirituality were gleaned from secular sources and from other religious traditions.

[48]A typical example of the renewed emphasis on the gospel mandate for education for justice is the comment by the Jesuit Michael Campbell-Johnson: "the needs of the poor take priority over the wants of the rich; the freedom of the weak takes priority over the liberty of the powerful; the participation of the marginalised groups takes priority over the preservation of an order which excludes them." ('Education for Justice', *The Tablet*, 23rd May 1992, p.641) The implications of this emphasis on education for justice for schools in the inner city are brought out succinctly by Bernadette O'Keeffe in 'Beacons of hope', *The Tablet*, 24th May 1997, pp.667-8. This article summarises and indicates the significance of *A Struggle for Excellence: Catholic Secondary Schools in Urban Poverty Areas*, Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, 1997.

[49]On the basis of my own experience (over twenty years) of assisting in staff selection for Catholic schools, as well as the comments on many diocesan officers and schools governors with similar experience, I have observed that very many Catholic teachers who present themselves for interview for senior posts in Catholic schools are clearly personally committed to Catholicism in their private lives and can give evidence that they are both academically and professionally well qualified and highly competent. Yet they appear to lack confidence when asked to articulate how their

work can contribute to the distinctive Catholic ethos of the school and they seem ill-equipped to relate their faith perspective to their prospective teaching and leadership responsibilities in anything other than superficial terms.

[50]Catholics have enjoyed the same massively increased participation in further and higher education as the rest of society. Many Catholic teachers have studied in secular colleges and universities, without a surrounding Catholic 'plausibility structure'. (see note 29, above) Even among those whose studies were carried out at Catholic institutions of higher education, many have come into contact only rarely with explicit expressions and explanations of a Catholic worldview. This would have been, in some cases, partly through their deliberate choice to avoid any engagement with Catholicism. It would also, in part, be due to the large numbers of non-Catholic students working alongside them whose main needs were for academic and professional qualifications, rather than for personal formation. For all students, in any case, the rules of validation of degrees and accreditation and certification of professional training deflected much of the energies of higher education staff towards meeting secular requirements, thereby leaving much less time and energy for study of the religious dimensions or implications of their subject matter. See Dawson, *Crisis*, p.114.

[51]Hornsby-Smith noted that "the dominant concern of the administrators of the Catholic school system since the second world war has been the size and expansion of the school system...[and that] there is a need to shift the emphasis more towards the qualitative outcomes of a Catholic education and the consideration of its effectiveness in terms of both academic and religious goals." (*Catholic Education : The Unobtrusive Partner,* London, Sheed & Ward, 1978, p.11.) It was clear by that time that the distinctiveness of Catholic schools was either unwarrantably taken for granted or that it was held with considerable 'fuzziness' or lack of clarity by many teachers, parents and policy-makers. Hornsby-Smith reports (pp.20-21) that there had been a century of continuous growth up to the early 1970s for the Catholic system of education in England and Wales. This was shown in the numbers of schools, pupils, teachers, financial commitments, colleges of education and student teachers. The position of Catholic colleges in the higher education system was to change rapidly after this, with several closures, and, in due time, reductions in the supply of Catholic teachers going from Catholic colleges into Catholic schools. See David Wells, *The Supply of Catholic Teachers*, London, Catholic Education Service, 1994.

[52]These five days, to be set aside for professional development purposes and to address school priorities, became part of teachers' conditions of service in 1987. This addition to teachers' workload, imposed by the government without consultation, offers another example of an unintended opportunity and prompt for reflection on Catholic education being provided by the government.

[53]For example, *The Inspection of Catholic Schools, Spiritual and Moral Development Across the Curriculum,* and *Partnership in the Training of Teachers for Catholic Schools*, all produced by the Catholic Education Service, London, 1995. Earlier publications which were - and still are - very helpful in identifying distinctive features of Catholic schools include *Evaluating the Distinctive Nature of a Catholic*

School (3rd edition, 1994) *Social and Moral Education in Catholic Schools*, (1994) *Education in Sexuality in Catholic Schools*, (1994) *What Are We to Teach?*, (1994) *Governing a Catholic School*, (1 & 2, 1992, 1994) *The Mission Statement into Action*, (1992)

[54]In 1994 the six Roman Catholic Colleges of Higher Education (La Sainte Union, Southampton, [which has now closed,] St Mary's, Twickenham, Digby Stuart, Roehampton, Trinity and All Saints, Leeds, Newman, Birmingham and the Liverpool Institute of Higher Education, which includes in its federation the former Christ's and Notre Dame Colleges - all under the aegis of the Catholic Education Service - set up a distance learning course for experienced teachers either aspiring to, or already exercising, leadership positions in Catholic schools. The course engages students in a three dimensional reflection on and interaction with a substantial Reader of extracts on Catholic educational principles, critical theory relating to management and the day-to-day tasks and experience of managing people and self, policy, learning and resources in the context of a Catholic school. The intention was to inject a degree of rigour and to raise the level of discussion on the distinctive nature of Catholic education among the teaching profession well above the fairly rudimentary level reached so far. After early signs of healthy recruitment figures, this course seems to have almost disappeared without trace and it has not become widely adopted by dioceses and governing bodies as a preferred criterion in person specifications for Headship or Deputy Headship positions within the Catholic sector. In 1997 a MA degree in Catholic School Leadership, the first of its kind in Britain, was launched at St Mary's University College. This course aims to equip students to exercise leadership roles and responsibilities in Catholic education; to promote a deeper understanding of Catholic principles relating to education; to facilitate a critical engagement with representative literature and research on school leadership and management; and to develop an appreciation of how Catholic principles can be integrated into and expressed through a range of leadership and management tasks.

[55]Some of the religious orders (for example the sisters of the Sacred Heart and the Society of Jesus) have also reflected on the relevance of their particular charism in the context of late twentieth century education. For an example of such rethinking, see *Foundations*, compiled by Carl Meirose, SJ, for the Jesuit Secondary Education Association, Washington, DC, 1994.

[56]In my own experience of regularly acting as consultant in schools, it appears that many teachers, faced with the need to act and lacking the opportunity, the habit or the intellectual culture or resources to reflect at leisure, constantly ask for guidance on 'how?', 'who?', 'when?', 'how often?' and 'with what?' with regard to carrying out a policy, but rarely ask 'why?', 'to what end?', 'with what value(s) in mind?' Time is not readily available to reflect on whether a proposed policy imports alien values which undermine or contradict those already espoused or whether it is in harmony with them.

[57]Cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994, p. 6. "This catechism...is meant to encourage and assist in the writing of new local catechisms, which take into account various situations and cultures, while carefully

preserving the unity of faith and fidelity to catholic doctrine." p.11. refers to "the adaptation of doctrinal presentations and catechetical methods required by differences of culture, age, spiritual maturity, and social and ecclesial condition among all those to whom it is addressed." It goes on to remind readers (from an earlier Roman Catechism) that "teachers must not imagine that a single kind of soul has been entrusted to them, and that consequently it is lawful to teach and form equally all the faithful in true piety with one and the same method!" Ibid. The quotation provides evidence of a move away from the assumption that preserving distinctiveness in Catholicism necessarily entails the imposition of uniformity. It significantly suggests that distinctiveness is compatible with, perhaps even requires, a degree of flexibility in meeting diverse needs and a measure of adaptability in expressing faith.

[58]See *The Idea of a University*, London, Longmans and Green, 1912.

[59]See *Education at the Crossroads* (Yale University Press, 1943), 'On some typical aspects of Christian education', pp.173-198 of *The Christian Idea of Education*, ed by Edmund Fuller (Yale University Press, 1957) and 'Thomist Views on Education', pp.57-90 of *Modern Philosophies and Education*, ed by Nelson Henry, (University of Chicago Press, 1955). See my comments on Maritain in chapter four.

[60]See Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan, volume 10 : *Topics in Education*, edited by Robert Doran and Frederick Crowe (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1993).

[61]For the relation between conversion and objectivity in knowledge, see my two articles in *Theology*, 'Subjectivity and Religious Understanding', November 1982, pp.410-417, and 'Lonergan, Conversion and Objectivity', September 1983, pp.345-353.

[62]G.K. Chesterton, 'A New Case for Catholic Schools', in *The Common Man*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1950.

[63]For signs of a renewed interest in a Catholic philosophy of education, see the jointly written article by David Carr, John Haldane, Terence McLaughlin and Richard Pring, 'Return to the Crossroads : Maritain Fifty Years On', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol XXXXIII, no. 2, June 1995, pp.162-178.

[64]On the ecumenical imperative in Christian education in general and for particular case studies of ecumenical experiments in education, see Priscilla Chadwick, *Schools of Reconciliation*, London, Cassell, 1994.

[65]Cf. "The demands of clarity must be kept in balance with the other demands of educational planning and management. Too much clarity can in some circumstances be unhelpful. For example, the illumination of complexity can be outfacing or disabling, and the consequence of bringing into sharp focus the full extent of disagreement between teachers can result in the inhibition of practical consensus and effective action. Ambiguity has a constructive and lubricative role here." McLaughlin, T. H., 'Values, Coherence and the School', in *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol.24, no. 3, 1994, p.459.

[66]John Haldane, 'Philosophy and Catholic Education', *The Sower*, April 1995, p.31.

[67]I do not deny the enduring centrality of the Eucharist to Catholicism, but I would claim that particular theories about 'what happens' in the sacrament, such as transubstantiation, are not crucial to the 'economy' of Catholicism and they are not relevant to my thesis.

[68]Cf John White, *Education and the End of Work*, London, Cassell, 1997, p.23. Also cf. John Shortt's observation that "although elements on their own may not always seem very different, it is their presence in the whole vision or way of thinking and living that makes the difference. In that whole, different elements may occupy more or less central places and be seen and emphasized in rather different ways." *Agenda for Educational Change*, Leicester, Apollos, 1997, p.295.

[69]The aspects listed do not have an 'epistemically primitive' function within Catholicism in the sense described by M. Leahy and R.S. Laura : "to say that [such] beliefs are epistemically primitive is to say that they have a threefold function in their particular belief systems: a presuppositional or foundational function, a constitutive function, and an organisational function. Epistemic primitives are the presuppositions upon which our belief systems rest. Unlike the other beliefs in such systems, they are not inferences made within a conceptual system. Rather they are presupposed by or provide the basis of significance for all the inferences made within that conceptual system. To say that epistemic primitives are constitutive of our belief systems is to say that such beliefs define what it means to engage in the systematic thinking which characterises the specific conceptual enterprise." 'Religious "Doctrines" and the Closure of Minds', *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, vol.31, no.2, 1997, p.335. Cf. John Shortt's comments (*op.cit.*, pp.284-5) about the part played by presuppositions in a worldview. "They give point to whole groups of statements...[they] make sense of the whole business." They are unavoidable, they are basic, they persist (unless we withdraw our commitment), they come in different strengths, they control enquiry in that they rule out some conclusions and require others. He adds : "the same conclusions can follow from different sets of premisses and, therefore, because presuppositions are a species of premiss, from different sets of presuppositions. This provides for the possibility of commonality in the beliefs of people with different worldviews."

[70]Gabriel Moran says that we can seek uniqueness either through a process of exclusion or of inclusion. Each has its limitations, for "no being can have no notes in common with all others; no being...can have all notes in common with the others." Seeking uniqueness through an ever greater effort at being inclusive, in striving for communion leads to a much richer understanding of uniqueness. For Moran part of the very distinctiveness or uniqueness of human beings is their openness to other natures. (*A Grammar of Responsibility*, New York, Crossroad, 1996, pp.165-6.)

[71]In chapter five I show how and in what respects inclusiveness is entailed by a Catholic approach to education.

[72]Cf the different views of (a) Milman and (b) Newman in the nineteenth century: (a) "These things are in heathenism, therefore they are not Christian" (b) "These things are in Christianity, therefore they are not heathen." Quoted in Dulles, Avery, *The Catholicity of the Church*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985, p.61.

[73]A glance at the most succinct summary statement (for England and Wales) of the key principles which determine the distinctive nature of Catholic education does not suggest an attempt by the Church to separate itself from values held more widely, or to advocate something which excludes other perspectives. This example of 'public theology' (see chapter one, note 75) suggests rather an attempt to include widely held values but to underwrite them in (non-technical) religious language. The five key principles are listed as : the search for excellence; the uniqueness of the individual; the education of the whole person; the education of all; and moral principles. Originally these principles were outlined in a pamphlet issued by the Bishops of England and Wales in the autumn of 1996, *Education in Catholic Schools and Colleges : Principles, Practices and Concerns*, p.3. Subsequently they were reissued, with further commentary and exemplification in *Learning from OFSTED and Diocesan Inspections & The Distinctive Nature of Education in Catholic Primary and Secondary Schools*, London, Catholic Education Service, 1996.

[74]I believe that the same assertion could defensibly be made for other forms of faith-based education, indeed for all consistently thought-through forms of education, since all attempts to educate in any systematic way imply a view of human nature, a reading of the world and a perspective on what is of central importance and true worth within - and possibly beyond - it.

[75]I owe this analogy to Paul Hager, (who quotes it from Bertrand Russell) in 'Relational Realism and Professional Performance', unpublished paper for Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1996, pp.164-5.

[76]David Smith (1997) in *Agenda for Educational Change*, op.cit., pp.27-28, says : "What educates is not only the 'facts' listed in the syllabus but the way they are organized and sequenced, the connections made, the implicit messages, the exclusions and silences."

[77]For an analysis of Newman's various uses of the term 'economy'. see Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990, pp.49-52, 705, and the same writer's *Newman and the Fullness of Christianity*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1993, p.11.

[78]I say more about liberal education and some its elements which are in tension with Catholic principles, in chapters four and five.

[79]McBrien, Richard, *Catholicism*, vol. II (Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1980, p. 1171.

[80]McBrien, *op.cit.* pp.1172-3.

[81]See Appendix 2 on Avery Dulles, for a more elaborate articulation of the distinctive features of Catholicism.

[82]McBrien *op. cit.* p. 1174.

[83]*op.cit.* p.1180. cf. McBrien (1994) 3rd edition, pp.9-10. cf. Dominic Milroy, 'What Makes a Catholic School Catholic?', *Priests and People*, August, 1996, p.339.

[84]McBrien, (1994), p.11.

[85]McBrien (1980), p.1183.

[86]McBrien (1980), p.1181. and (1994), p.12.

[87]McBrien (1980), p.1181.

[88]McBrien (1994), p.11.

[89]Dulles, *Catholicity of the Church,* p.159.

[90]For a short study of the shadow side of Jesus and the Church, see Stephen Pattison, 'The Shadow Side of Jesus', *Studies in Christian Ethics*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1995, pp.54-67. Cf Rohr, Richard and Martos, Joseph, *Why Be Catholic?,* Cincinnati, St Anthony Messenger Press, 1989, pp.37-68, where the authors examine the shadow side of Catholicism, (particularly in the USA) and where they criticise the Church for sometimes being uncatholic, narrowly ethnic, overinstitutional, unscriptural, undemanding, and too influenced by consumerism.

[91]Dulles, *Catholicity,* p.6.

[92]Dulles, *ibid.*, pp.98-9.

[93]H.O.Evennett, quoted in *Signposts and Homecomings*, edited by David Konstant, Slough, St Paul Publications, 1981, p.118.

[94]Conrad, Richard, *The Catholic Faith*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994, pp.63-4.

[95]Boys, Mary, *Educating in Faith : Maps and Visions,* San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1989, p.89.

CHAPTER THREE

Distinctive Components in Catholic Education

The central issue of this thesis is the coherence of the claim that Catholic education is both distinctive and inclusive. Are these two features of Catholic education, distinctiveness and inclusiveness, compatible, and, if so, how is their relationship to be understood? Does the claim to offer a distinctive philosophy of education, one which is seen as requiring, in the context of this country, the provision of separate, denominational schools, necessarily entail a degree of exclusiveness on the part of the Catholic Church? How does the claim that 'to be Catholic is to be inclusive' relate to the claim to be distinctive?

Before any of these questions can be satisfactorily answered, it is necessary to clarify the nature of and foundation for the claim that Catholic education is distinctive. Only when this has been done will it be possible to consider the kinds of exclusiveness and inclusiveness which necessarily follow from (or are debarred by) a Catholic philosophy of education. The main task of this chapter is to clarify the key components of the claim to distinctiveness. In the following chapter I delineate the distinctive worldview which underpins the educational principles described here. Taken together, in focusing on the components, foundations and implications of the claim to distinctiveness in a Catholic philosophy of education, these two chapters will indicate further the problematical nature of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness, before I suggest a way forward in chapters five, six and seven.

First, I provide here a summary and analysis of the principal Roman documents which contain the Church's official teaching about Catholic schools. Second, I bring out the

interconnectedness and coherence of the various themes and principles which together constitute a distinctively Catholic educational philosophy. Third, in order to demonstrate how some of the themes emerging from the documents can be held together without contradiction, in a creative tension, and in such a way that they mutually support and illuminate one another, I draw on the thought of a writer whose work has been almost completely neglected in the literature on Catholic education, Friedrich von Hügel (1852-1925). Von Hügel deserves careful study as part of this thesis because he demonstrated in his life and writings that the Catholic attempt to combine distinctiveness and inclusiveness is possible.

3.1.1 *Declaration on Christian Education*

I have already mentioned (in 2.3) the shift of emphasis brought about by the rethinking carried out at the Second Vatican Council (1962-65). As a result of this shift of emphasis it is possible to discern a more positive attempt in church teaching to promote the fullest development of the human person and to integrate Christian education more closely into the whole pattern of life recognised as being both social and multi-dimensional, with God reaching out to us in all dimensions of our existence, not merely inwardly in our spiritual lives or via the workings of conscience. In the *Declaration on Christian Education (Gravissimum Educationis)* we read that

> education should pave the way to brotherly association with other peoples, so that genuine unity and peace on earth may be promoted. For a true education aims at the formation of the human person with respect to his ultimate goal, and simultaneously with respect to the good of those societies of which he is a member.[1]

Preparing people to enjoy life with God does not in any way entail inviting them to turn away from this world, its needs and their responsibilities. Although they are to be

illumined by faith, Catholic schools must also "have the same cultural aims as all other schools and be opened to the contemporary world."[2]

In addition to this positive stance towards the world, four further points can be picked out from this Declaration as having relevance to mapping the key concepts within a Catholic view of education. These are, firstly, the special importance granted to parents as the primary educators of their children,[3] secondly, the kind of community atmosphere to be created and maintained at school, one that is "enlivened by the gospel spirit of freedom and charity," thirdly, the striving to relate all of human culture to the news of salvation[4], and, finally, affirmation of the autonomy of the various branches of knowledge. These are to be taught "according to their own proper principles and methods and with due freedom of scientific investigation."[5]

It can be seen that, taken on its own, *Gravissimum Educationis* does not constitute substantial building blocks for a Catholic philosophy of education. This was recognised within the document itself: "these principles will have to be developed at greater length by a special postconciliar Commission and applied by episcopal conferences to varying situations."[6] The third and fourth principles mentioned above, namely that which concerns the relationship between faith and culture and that which defends the autonomy of the various disciplines, are particularly important for this study. They recur in later Roman documents and I will comment further on them in due course. The second principle, with its emphasis on freedom and charity, provides guidance on the ethos, 'atmosphere' or 'climate' which is necessary if education is to avoid being domineering and if it is to be open to the particular perspectives and needs of students.

In fact, that further development of principles hinted at the start of *Gravissimum Educationis* was delayed for some time after the Council closed in 1965. It may well be claimed that the progress of Catholic education after the mid nineteen-sixties was influenced less by the Council's direct teaching on education than indirectly by piecemeal and partial assimilation of other Council teachings, for example, those encouraging a more responsible role for the laity within the church, greater participation within the liturgy, more familiarity with the scriptures, more openness with regard to fellow-Christians and to people of other faiths, greater readiness to contribute to the transformation of the world, and a renewed willingness to search for God's revelation in one's own experience, rather than merely in sacred writings or in the past. The Church shared in society's general advocacy of the need for freedom from coercion, with more allowance made for personal choice. This itself is a far cry from some of the pronouncements of nineteenth century popes such as Gregory XVI and Pius IX, who both rejected in their encyclicals freedom of conscience and the idea of tolerance.[7]

3.1.2 *The Catholic School*

It was not until 1977, twelve years after the Council closed, that a major document relating to education was issued from Rome. This was *The Catholic School.* It was to be followed by *Catechesi Tradendae* (1979), *Lay Catholics in Schools : Witnesses to Faith* (1982), and *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School* (1988).

In *The Catholic School* we find an acknowledgement of the existence of objections to Catholic education, including a general rejection of church institutions, accusations of proselytism, of outdatedness, class distinction, poor educational results and difficulties

over staffing and finance.[8] None of these objections is given more than a cursory mention, which is a pity, first, because they are grave allegations and merit a serious response and second, because there is some evidence from this country as well as from the USA and from Australia that children in Catholic schools generally receive a sound education, one that equips them well by comparison with the educational outcomes secured by secular schools.[9] Rather than face accusations of shortcomings in Catholic schools, the Sacred Congregation goes on to reiterate the need for Catholic schools to bear institutional witness for the Church and its values, especially in the face of certain damaging or debilitating influences in society. These include relativism, materialism, pragmatism, depersonalisation and a mass production mentality and cultural pluralism.[10]

Five positive principles or themes emerge, some taking up points from *Gravissimum Educationis*, others providing fresh nuances. The first of these principles is indicated in that phrase which has become more and more influential - or at least repeated - in the literature on church schools, the 'integral formation of the whole person'.[11] As yet this expression is still being treated in a fairly undeveloped way, without further description and without an attempt at analysis. It will be taken up again in both the next two sources, each time being given a little more 'thickness' in treatment.

The second principle is that Christ should be the foundation of the whole educational enterprise in a Catholic school.[12] An understanding of Christ will offer new meaning to life and will show how all human values find their fulfilment and unity.[13] This centrality of Christ, although it is not unpacked or explained in this way, might nevertheless with justification be taken to imply three things. First, his teaching should be fully and faithfully conveyed, so that children receive the *information* necessary for salvation, enabling them to hear and respond to the Gospel. Second, a

personal relationship with Christ is aspired to. This relationship is advocated as an ideal for pupils to strive towards and it is encouraged as worthy of both communal and individual effort. It should be embodied in and witnessed to by the teachers, so that children receive an appropriate *formation*. Third, the principal decisions and policies of the school are referred to both the teaching and the person of Christ in the context of personal prayer, corporate worship and joint reflection; this would ensure that Christ would truly serve as a reference point or *touchstone* within the school.

The remaining three principles will be treated briefly here since they will crop up again when we survey the next two documents. At first sight it might appear that there is some tension between the third principle and the fourth and fifth ones (which should be taken together as mutually supportive). The third principle states that, with regard to a Catholic school, "its task is fundamentally a synthesis of culture and faith, and a synthesis of faith and life: the first is reached by integrating all the different aspects of human knowledge through the subjects taught, in the light of the Gospel; the second in the growth of the virtues characteristic of the Christian."[14] This is a compressed or dense statement; neither its meaning nor its implications are immediately apparent.

The relationship to be established between faith and culture presupposes a positive reading of and response to creation, stemming from the deeper appreciation of the implications of belief in the Incarnation which was shown both during and after Vatican II. Cultures vary enormously in their composition and they may, to varying degrees, contain features which do not harmonise easily with Christian beliefs, for example, in their attitudes or practices regarding the body, nature, gender, the environment, the individual, or people of other races. Therefore further guidance will be needed, both to facilitate accurate discernment of what is peripheral and what is

central to a culture, and to give insight into what is compatible with and what is hostile to Christian faith. Cultural analysis in the light of Christian faith should reveal what should be shunned as essentially dangerous, what can be warmly embraced as positive and beneficial and what can be safely engaged with in an attempt to convert it from being merely neutral or perhaps only a minimal support for faith in its present state into a more secure ally.

Even on the most optimistic estimate of pupils' maturity and motivation, this analysis is beginning to sound like a task that is well beyond the capacities of most of them, and, indeed, of most of their teachers. The whole topic of inculturation has become an extremely important one in the modern church, as attempts are made to relate the many different African, Asian and Latin American cultures to the Gospel in a move away from European cultural dominance.[15] The issue is complex, controversial, taxes the minds of the most sophisticated thinkers and is certainly still an area of church development that is unlikely to be resolved in the near future.[16] Schools will contribute to the discussion. They will provide a test-bed or arena for experimentation.[17] But they will also need much more guidance than is currently available.[18]

An outcome of a better understanding of the respective rights and values of faith and culture and their interrelationship might well be the emergence of a much more rigorous and radical critique of our own culture than we have witnessed so far. It would be ironic if, after praising the values represented by church schools, and lauding the success enjoyed by them, politicians were to find that, as they more truly discovered their own identity, such schools entered into a more confrontational mode with prevailing political values.[19]

The fourth and fifth principles which we can identify in *The Catholic School* concern the autonomy of the various subjects taught and the development of the critical faculties of pupils. "Individual subjects must be taught according to their own particular methods. It would be wrong to consider (them) as mere adjuncts to faith or as a useful means of teaching apologetics."[20] The value in the subjects lies not only in the different types of knowledge they yield, the skills they demand of us, and the attitudes they foster, but also in their methodology. This means that the church cannot tell physicists how to do physics, historians how to practise history, artists how to work through their chosen medium, and so on. There cannot be a Catholic science, mathematics, music, sociology or physical education curriculum, in the sense that such subjects are studied differently from the way they would be studied in secular schools. There must not be any theological imperialism or undue pressure on the natural autonomy of the disciplines which would distort them.[21]

These subjects can be treated in such a way that they raise larger questions than the disciplines themselves directly address. I am not referring here to the selection of subject matter of specific interest to Catholics as exemplary material for study, for example in literature, music, art, history and so on. Would such selection consider those artefacts which are produced by Catholics or those which, whether produced by Catholics or not, addressed matters considered of great moment by Catholics? To move down this route would create difficulties for some areas of the curriculum and it would distort the nature of the different disciplines in a way clearly condemned by the Sacred Congregation. As John Haldane says, "a Catholic approach to history is not to be confused with an approach to Catholic history."[22] Both are legitimate activities within Catholic schools. But the first is more important than the second. The autonomy of the discipline makes it possible, but not obligatory, for us to invite students to examine history in a perspective which is *sub specie aeternitatis* and as

"the working out of a particular providential plan."[23] It needs to be made clear to students that it is not historical methodology which suggests such a reading of history, for questions about purposes wider than those of the actors involved do not automatically arise. It is from a religious world-view that further questions arise about the material yielded by the discipline of history.[24] The same could be said for science.[25]

This means that there are two extremes to be avoided. One would be to present the various subjects of the curriculum in such a way that they all illustrate and serve a particular world-view, its perspectives and values, in this case, Catholicism. In itself, this is a valid and possible way of interpreting the disciplines, through the eyes of faith. However, if this is the *only* role played by the curriculum areas, there is the danger of ignoring the autonomy of individual curriculum subjects and also of indoctrinating students. I have already noted that the first of these is condemned in the document under review. The same is true of the second danger. The fifth principle refers to

> the systematic formation of the pupils' critical faculties to bring them to a measure of self-control and the ability to choose freely....They must be taught to subject (what is offered by the organs of social communication) to a critical and personal analysis, take what is good, and integrate it into their Christian human culture.[26]

However, within church documents, including the ones under review, there seems to be little recognition that the development of critical faculties is just as likely and just as legitimately to be directed at the Catholic faith and its intellectual and institutional expressions as at anything else.

The second extreme to be avoided is to distinguish too absolutely a secular from a religious curriculum and to rule out in advance the raising of religious questions and

moral issues in the teaching of the various curriculum areas. To respect the autonomy of the disciplines does not entail that one cannot legitimately ask questions or suggest perspectives. What we bring to a subject can make a difference to what we find in it. This is not distortion, so long as we respect the methodological criteria properly to be employed in that area of study.

It is also possible to emphasise the autonomy of the disciplines in such a way that their mutual interrelationships are ignored and to treat each one in isolation from the others to such a degree that we lose sight of the fact that they are depicting only an aspect of a larger reality. To leave pupils with a compartmentalised view of knowledge will not help them to develop critical faculties, concepts and attitudes that are transferable. It will not equip them to develop a synthesis between culture and faith. Just as God's grace can work in all of us to complete and transform our nature, rather than to diminish or erase it, so too all areas of knowledge can be penetrated by a religious perspective without loss of their particular nature.[27] A better appreciation of this viewpoint depends upon a deeper analysis of a Catholic perspective on human nature and an exploration of the relationship between humanity and divinity. This will be taken up in the next chapter.

Several implications follow from the teaching of *The Catholic School*. First, in various curriculum areas, examples of the impact of faith should be considered in a church school, for example, in art, drama, music, literature and history. Second, challenges to faith (and to the ensuing lifestyle entailed by it) should be confronted as they arise from the evidence and perspectives yielded by different school studies, for example, in geography, science, technology and social studies. Third, from a faith perspective, each subject should be seen *sub specie aeternitatis* and therefore viewed as having a derived, rather than an absolute, autonomy. Given that each curriculum

area is, in scriptural terms, a 'principality', pupils should be assisted in developing a capacity to critique its presuppositions and methodology, and thereby alerted, not only to its insights, but also to its bias and incompleteness. In this way pupils can learn to resist reductionist claims which might be made by those who adopt uncritically the perspectives and the categories deriving from the various disciplines. The capacity of teachers to combine successfully the three principles of integration of faith and culture, autonomy of the disciplines and development of the critical faculties of pupils will depend, in part at least, on their display of those inclusive pedagogical virtues which I outline in chapter five.

I conclude this section with two comments. Any attempt to distinguish *sharply* a secular from a religious curriculum is not in harmony with a Catholic perspective on education. Yet clearly it has to be admitted that there is some tension - but not contradiction - between the threefold imperative advocated in *The Catholic School:* to develop a synthesis between culture and faith, to respect the autonomy of the disciplines and to cultivate freedom of choice and critical faculties among pupils.

3.1.3 *Catechesi Tradendae*

Strictly speaking, this papal encyclical is not about Catholic schools, but about catechesis, the deliberate and ongoing process of deepening the faith of believers and putting them, not only in touch, but in communion with Jesus Christ.[28] In a sense the document relativises the importance of schools in this task by making it clear that the principal form of catechesis is that of adults and by its insistence that the pre-eminent place for it is the parish.[29] However, there are also several pointers here for how Catholic education, wherever it takes place, should be directed and for some of

its characteristic features. I pick out five points from the encyclical for particular consideration.

First, the encyclical is unequivocal about the central importance of religious education in a Catholic school. The distinctive importance given to this subject should be reflected in the quality of its provision. "The special character of the Catholic school, the underlying reason for it, the reason why parents should prefer it, is precisely the quality of the religious instruction integrated into the education of the pupils."[30] Catholic schools should consider the practical implications for the allocation of time, resources and status to this crucial aspect of the curriculum, as well as the steps required to ensure high quality provision, while the wider Catholic community must endeavour to provide appropriate pre-service education and training, followed by continuing professional development opportunities.

Second, the activity of catechesis should strengthen both the internal life of the church, as a community of believers, and also its external activity as missionary, that is, as bringing the message of the Gospel to the diverse situations and structures in which people find themselves.[31] This suggests that Catholic education should be concerned, internally, for the spiritual welfare of Catholics and externally, for the common good. There is a close connection between these two, such that proper attention to the one correlates to an adequate consideration of the other.

Third, catechesis is a multi-dimensional activity which is bound up with the whole of the church's life; it cannot be restricted to the imparting of doctrinal truths in isolation from a study of the gospels, the experience of Christian living and church membership, sacramental celebration, an engagement with apologetics, apostolic activity and missionary witness.[32] This suggests a comprehensiveness of approach

and a coordination of methods and messages which can perhaps only be adequately developed in an atmosphere which allows education to be conducted along faith-based lines and in the light of assumptions governed by a religious worldview. Here a mutual exclusiveness marks both secular and faith-based approaches to education: in a secular context, there is no mandate to treat religion as the privileged bearer of truth or as having any right to be embedded in the public life of the school; in a religious context, not to allow these things is to emasculate religion by denying its claims, character and scope for operation.

The message for Catholic educators here is twofold. First, they should see their vocation as part of the missionary work of the Church. To act in isolation from and without reference to the wider Church, even in the process of living out 'Gospel values,' would be profoundly un-Catholic. This emphasis on belonging goes much further than mere mutual protection, of 'looking after one's own'; for the benefits of ecclesial participation are not yielded without suffering the accompanying burdens of mutual responsibility, correction and accommodation, of chafing and friction.[33] Second, they should endeavour to adopt the multi-dimensional approach to education in faith, as indicated in the encyclical, so that there is a permeation of the Christian message throughout the curriculum and in all aspects of community life in the school.

This last point is related to a fourth theme of *Catechesi Tradendae*, that of the need for a 'balanced renewal'.[34] Without the comprehensiveness of the organic and systematic approach mentioned in the previous paragraph, the various elements can become distorted in our understanding and cannot play their particular part. The encyclical looks for a balance between fidelity to traditional content and openness to innovation in methodology, recognizing that excess in either of these is possible: "routine leads to stagnation, lethargy and eventual paralysis. Improvisation begets

confusion...and the fracturing of unity."[35] In a context of balanced renewal, where adequate time is given to doctrine, celebration and commitment,[36] a proper place will be found for the ecumenical dimension of Christian teaching and also for conveying the Church's social teaching.[37]

Fifth, a theme of major importance for this thesis is briefly touched upon at several points in *Catechesi Tradendae*. This is the need for the catechist, and, by implication, the educator, to be attentive to the developmental stage, interests, language and values of learners and sensitive to their diverse cultural backgrounds.[38] This inclusive form of pedagogy is advocated, not from any prudent or clever attempt to 'win' the attention of learners or to manipulate their affections, but rather as a necessary expression of respect for human dignity, of belief in the sacredness of each person and of acceptance that the Holy Spirit works beyond, as well as within the bounds of the visible church. Although the language of inclusiveness and inculturation in the context of education is not highly developed in this encyclical, there is sufficient emphasis on these themes to justify my claim that they should be considered central features of any Catholic school and essential elements in the very distinctiveness claimed for such schools.

3.1.4 *Lay Catholics*

The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education issued *Lay Catholics in Schools: Witnesses to Faith* in 1982. This reiterates two themes we have already covered and then goes on to develop in some detail a new requirement or key ingredient for Catholic schools. The notion of integral human formation, one which responds to all the needs of the human person, and which leads to the fullest development of all that is human in us, again receives strong affirmation.[39] The synthesis of culture and faith

is also once again highlighted as a major aim.[40] Where this document moves further than those touched upon already is with regard to the need to nurture the vocation and spirituality of the teacher.[41]

One reason for this is to provide for pupils models of people who have integrated in themselves a synthesis of culture, faith and life and who operate with a sense of vocation. If pupils can experience such teachers this increases the possibility that in due course they too will develop such a synthesis and a similar sense of vocation. At least they will have witnessed these things for themselves. Other reasons given for the fresh emphasis in *Lay Catholics* on nurturing the spirituality and vocation of teachers include the increasingly important role played by lay people within the church in general and in Catholic schools in particular, a heightened awareness since Vatican II of the lay apostolate, a recognition of the huge personal demands made upon teachers and a consciousness that they cannot impart what they do not possess in themselves.

I have already noted earlier that Catholic schools are now staffed by far fewer clergy and professed 'religious' brothers and sisters and with far more lay people than used to be the case, and that few of these lay teachers have received a comprehensive Catholic higher education themselves. Many are neither theologically literate nor have they benefited from any deliberate spiritual formation. It is a special concern of *Lay Catholics* that teachers in a Catholic school should participate in its liturgical and sacramental life, that they should have a mature spiritual personality, and that their religious formation should be of the same high level as their general, cultural and professional formation.[42] If teachers are not oriented towards personal sanctification and do not possess a clear sense of their apostolic mission, if their own development is imbalanced or lacking key ingredients, then the school will wander further and further

away from its objectives. Such concern is reminiscent of Newman's emphasis on the role of personal influence in assisting us to find the truth.

> Persons influence us, voices melt us, looks subdue us, deeds inflame us.[43] ... We shall find it difficult to estimate the moral power which a single individual, trained to practise what he teaches, may acquire in his own circle, in the course of years.[44]

3.1.5 *The Religious Dimension*

Six years after *Lay Catholics*, another, more substantial set of guidelines for reflection and renewal were published by the Congregation for Catholic Education, entitled *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School.* Once again we find extensive treatment of three themes that are now familiar. Firstly, respect for the autonomy of different academic disciplines and the methodology proper to them is stressed. These disciplines "are not to be seen merely as subservient to faith."[45]

Secondly, the synthesis of faith and culture is underlined, this time being brought out with a slightly different emphasis, one that reminds us less of the benefits to culture of close alignment with faith and more of the inadequacy of faith if it is not enriched and given body by culture. "Faith which does not become culture is faith which is not received fully, not assimilated entirely, not lived faithfully."[46] On the other hand, this relationship is not to be purely one-sided, since there is an expectation that the various subjects - science, technology, history and art are mentioned in particular - will not ignore the religious dimension; indeed religious values and a religious motivation are to be cultivated in all subject areas.[47]

Thirdly, integral human formation as a goal is reinforced, this time filled out in two ways: by reference to a Christian 'reading' or analysis of the person and then also by a

stress on the call to perfection which must be part of the systematic presentation of faith. In summary form, the human person " is created in the 'image and likeness' of God; elevated by God to the dignity of a child of God; unfaithful to God in original sin, but redeemed by Christ; a temple of the Holy Spirit; a member of the Church; destined to eternal life."[48] The personal example of teachers will be crucial in modelling what integral human formation and development will look like. Included among the qualities they need to display will be : affection, tact, understanding, serenity of spirit, a balanced judgement, patience in listening to others and prudence in the way they respond.[49]

So far I have picked out from this document the emphases on academic autonomy, the mutually enriching relationship between faith and culture and the full development of each student - and what these require of teachers. The climate in which all this has to be worked at is one permeated by the Gospel spirit of freedom and love.[50] Although there is a danger that the distinctiveness of Catholic schools will be defended on the grounds simply that they provide a caring ethos, as if this were not a quality which is both aspired to and successfully achieved in many types of school, it is certainly the case that the shift in attention from doctrinal orthodoxy and moral correctness in teaching to the wider experience of pupils of the whole curriculum, both explicit and hidden, has not been without benefit in clarifying what is implied by offering a consistent and humane approach to education in a Catholic context.[51] This shift is more a matter of degree than a radical re-orientation, since both doctrinal orthodoxy and moral correctness still play a significant role in a Catholic philosophy of education, as I seek to demonstrate in chapter four.

3.1.6 Prioritising themes

In reviewing key features of Catholic education, as outlined in the relevant Roman documents from Vatican II onwards, it has become clear that three themes have emerged as of central importance: the integral development of the human person, the autonomy of the various branches of knowledge and the synthesis of faith and culture. It is not easy to see how these three can be held together, since they emphasize different priorities: the first emphasizing the individual, the second focusing on the academic subjects of study while the third underlines the importance of religion in the conduct and interpretation of life. It has also become clear that these three are supposed to be integrally bound up with one another. In one way or another each of these themes is affected by a Catholic interpretation of the relationship between nature and grace and between humanity and divinity. This relationship will be explored in the following chapter. At this point however, I would contend that a better understanding of these three themes will be the most fruitful way to get at the heart of a Catholic concept of education in the school context. Even from among these three, I believe it is possible to single out one theme as having overriding priority, as being the most central way of all to get to grips with what is meant by Catholic education, namely the integral formation or development of the whole person. Yet because of the special light that can be cast on the full meaning of this notion within an educational context by a deeper appreciation of the other two themes - the autonomy of the branches of knowledge and the synthesis between faith and culture - it would be unwise to treat this main theme in isolation from them.

I leave on one side at this point several other important features which are considered equally important for Catholic education in the documents I have analysed. These include, first, an understanding of the person of Christ and his call to perfection, a

theme which I tackle in chapter four; second, the need for building a school community based on the Gospel spirit of freedom and love, a theme I explore in the context of analysing inclusiveness in chapter five; and, third, the desire of the church to give to the world a positive institutional witness to the importance of education, a theme I develop further in chapter seven. I believe that a deeper exploration of what might be meant by integral development of the human person promises to shed most light on the particular question being wrestled with here, which is: what is the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education?[52]

3.2 Interconnectedness

At different times some of the emphases within Catholic education inevitably alter. This might be because different theological schools of thought and styles of expression rise to prominence or fall into disfavour within the church itself. It might arise in response to external challenges from differing types of opposing philosophies as these are brought to bear upon both theorists and policy makers. Another prompt for such differing emphases might be new questions or concerns which emerge in the course of a society's or a culture's development. The church's educational philosophy will be articulated differently if the prevailing style of her theological or philosophical thinking is being expressed in terms borrowing heavily from, for example, Thomism (whether traditional or transcendental) or process theology, or existentialism, or liberation theology. Catholic claims to offer a distinctive education will stress different aspects of the church's message depending upon whether threats to this are perceived as coming from, for example, communism, nationalism, naturalism, hedonism, scientism, modernism or relativism. Defenders of Catholic education will revise their advocacy as they respond to newly emerging concerns and questions raised about, for example, industrialization, secularism, pluralism, feminism, racism, ecology, medical

ethics and issues arising from sophisticated and powerful computerised information systems.[53]

Of course, I am not denying the strong element of continuity within Catholic education. Most of what had been argued for in earlier statements of the church's educational philosophy remains: religion as the core of the curriculum, Christ as the model for human life, the church as the medium of living tradition which cannot be bypassed, the spiritual dimension of life to receive due attention, morality to be seen in objective terms, mortality to be kept in view and the essential interrelatedness of all areas of knowledge.

It is this last aspect, the interconnectedness, that I wish to underline here, for three reasons. First, the particular form of a belief system's interconnectedness will have implications for the kinds of education it seeks to foster. Second, it is the belief in the *essential* interconnectedness of the various elements of Catholic education which lead to a desire on the part of the Catholic community to establish and maintain separate schooling, rather than to provide *additional* teaching of those elements which have not been covered in mainstream schooling. One might claim, in the light of the previous analysis of Catholic principles, that neither the explicitly religious nor the apparently secular can be properly appreciated if taught in isolation from the other. Third, without an emphasis on interconnectedness, some of the key elements within Catholic education that have been highlighted could be distorted.

According to an authoritative document issued on behalf of the Catholic Bishops of England and Wales, "Catholic education is distinctive not by being exclusive (for it gives to all human activities their due emphasis), but by bringing into all such activities a special perspective which is derived from communion with Christ."[54] I take this to

mean first, that Christ is to be of paramount importance in the life of a Christian, second, that through relationship with Christ a believer will find that all things will 'make sense', but only in the light of a continuing process of conversions in our thinking and lifestyle, and third, that in the context of Catholic education it is appropriate to consider the relevance of the teaching and example of Christ for all aspects of knowledge and action.

It is sometimes hard for outsiders to appreciate that, in the context of Catholic education, this special perspective means more than simply a feature to be added to what would otherwise be a standard educational programme, for example, more time for specific religious teaching, or more frequent occasions of collective worship. All the various elements within education, as the bishops' report indicates, are affected by its focal point, its leading principle, its special perspective: "curriculum, syllabus, discipline, systems of reward and punishment, worship, relationships, community, catechesis."[55] Chesterton recognized that, according to its own logic, Catholic theology would be all-pervasive in a school following a Catholic conception of education; such theology could not be taught for only part of the time, in separate packages labelled religious education, and then hidden away or left on one side. As he said,

> every education teaches a philosophy; if not by dogma then by suggestion, by implication, by atmosphere. Every part of that education has a connection with every other part. If it does not all combine to convey some general view of life, it is not education at all.[56]

This was as true for the Catholic as for any other approach to education.[57] Therefore not only will religious teaching be distinctive in Catholic education, but many other aspects of school life are expected to reflect Catholic principles or priorities, for

example, sex education, teacher appraisal, pupil assessment, parental rights and relationships with the local community.

There is also an interconnectedness between what is frequently understood to be the enduring four dimensions within Catholic education: its interpretation of its central message, the kind of community it seeks to be, the nature of service to be fostered and the worship to be offered. Each one of these four requires the assistance of the others; each one will have repercussions on the others. What Chesterton in his essay on Catholic education called atmosphere or environment is sometimes spoken of as "permeation." Mary Boys cites one recent attempt to articulate a contemporary notion of permeation: "When the people of a school share a certain intentionality, a certain pattern or complex of values, understandings, sentiments, hopes and dreams, that deeply conditions everything else that goes on."[58] This would include both the explicit and the hidden curriculum, as well as extra-curricular activities, the school's social arrangements for staff and students and the methods used to evaluate progress towards carrying out the school's mission.

This notion of permeation flows from the central importance given to religion within a Catholic school and from the belief that "religion affects and is affected by every element in the formation of a person."[59] I will show (in 3.3.2) how von Hügel insisted that the religious dimension of life can attain its greatest richness only when all other aspects of human life are equally well developed.[60] Any omission, imbalance or exaggeration in one area of study will have repercussions elsewhere and will certainly undermine religious maturity and well-being.

> Thus personal relations and family life, physical health and nutrition, the study of the humanities, the rigorous pursuit of the sciences, engagement in politics, construction of the social order, involvement in commerce and the production of goods, all are of the

> greatest concern to Catholic Christianity, because all are aspects of the whole person and in their interplay, sometimes harmonious, sometimes contentious, full humanity emerges.[61]

The advocacy of permeation is at the same time a refusal to accept any rigid or permanent compartmentalising of school life, for example, into secular and religious spheres. No ultimate separation between what might be called sacred and what might be called profane can be sustained.[62] What is being looked for is a *synthesis* where the Christian perspective is neither merely *juxtaposed* - or simply put alongside of a secular curriculum - nor *superimposed.* Any attempt at theological imperialism, where all aspects are taught under the direction and scrutiny of religious principles, is a misinterpretation of the nature of the synthesis envisaged.[63] Study of secular realities is not to be adulterated by nor subordinated to contact with a religious perspective on life which is all-consuming, suffocating, distorting or constricting.[64] Nor is religion itself to be absorbed within a secular world-view: the transcendent should not be described as if it refers merely to the term of our continuing and natural development, thereby being rendered as immanent.

An interesting comparison might be made between the approach advocated here and that argued for by some Reformed Christian writers.[65] Nelson distinguished three approaches to faith-discipline integration: compatibility, reconstruction and transformation. The first of these places a premium on the effort to locate and to integrate *compatible* elements indigenous both to the scholar's Christian faith and to his discipline. Academic knowledge is independent of faith, but can be related to it. The second sees no common ground and aims for a complete rebuilding of the discipline from biblical foundations and Christian assumptions. Claims to disciplinary autonomy, according to this view, are attempts to do without God and they build on

'epistemological sand'. The third approach recognizes that between Christian faith and the secular disciplines there are at least *some* shared assumptions and concerns, but also a need to transform the academic discipline in order to do justice to the sovereign and comprehensive claims of Christ.

In this transformationalist approach, the elements of secular academic disciplines, which do not depend on biblical foundations or on Christian assumptions, are neither dismissed nor suppressed; but they do need to be re-shaped in the light of the converted person's transformed view of self and world. The reconstructionist campaigns 'from outside', in an assault on the false priorities and inadequate methods of secular disciplines, and seeks to expose their folly and to tear down their temples of distortion, whereas the transformationist works from within them, in a much less drastic way, to bring them gradually closer to a biblically inspired understanding of that discipline.[66]

The approach I have advocated is much closer to transformation than to reconstruction, since I believe that the latter approach allows too little scope for the operation of the (admittedly derived) autonomy of the academic disciplines, denies their positive insights, exaggerates their distortions, stifles their capacity to be creative and constructive and prevents the healthy friction von Hügel describes (see 3.3.3, below) as one of the contributions of the non-religious dimensions of life to our spiritual development. Together with writers of the reformed tradition I am qualifying the notion of the autonomy of the disciplines, not in service of any theological imperialism, which is always to be resisted, but in acknowledgement of God as the source and goal of all truth, in allowing for the limitations of human penetration of truth, and in recognition of the complementarity of various perspectives on truth.

Several implications follow from such a view. First, the methodology and findings of any particular discipline are to be considered, despite their construction by human 'instruments' or agents, as potential avenues towards an understanding of God's purposes for us, rather than merely as serving purposes we have arrived at for ourselves.[67] Second, we should, in due humility, allow for the tentativeness or provisionality of the knowledge we think we have arrived at, this being as true of claims to religious knowledge as of any other kind. Third, the findings of one discipline are best appreciated in the light of complementary knowledge provided by other disciplines; none (including theology) is adequate on its own. The totality of disciplines together constitute a circle in which each one conditions, frames, challenges and illuminates the others.

Also in the Reformed tradition, Badley draws on Nelson's three broad categories and employs them to analyse alternative approaches to the integration in the curriculum of faith and learning. He argues that a Christian should aim for a combination of a perspectival and an incarnational form of integration, that is, one which reviews every area of the curriculum from the perspective of a Christian worldview and also one where the teacher personally exemplifies a congruence between content, methodology and lifestyle and where she embodies a harmony between the life of faith and the pursuit of academic study.[68] *Both* these forms of integration are necessary educational implications of a Christian worldview, since any attempt to bring a transforming Christian perspective to bear upon an area of academic study needs the teacher's personal example to give it purchase and credibility and to make it sufficiently attractive to be worth serious consideration by pupils; and over-reliance on the good example of teachers, without the attempt to bring a Christian perspective to bear upon and to transform the disciplines, fails to engage with academic subjects

adequately and leads to a juxtaposition between, rather than a synthesis of faith and culture.[69]

I have suggested that integral to a Catholic philosophy of education is a belief that the different areas of the curriculum have a relative autonomy and yet a mutual interdependence and that teachers should not separate religion from other aspects of school life. I have also described a religious perspective as having a crucial role in the curriculum if the pupils are to develop a synthesis between faith, life and culture. There are clearly pedagogic and curriculum implications which follow from such an emphasis for those Catholics who teach subjects other than religion in church schools. This situation is made more complex when teachers who are not Catholics work in Catholic schools and are expected to contribute to a (religiously based) holistic or integral approach.[70] If harmony is to emerge from the various contributions to the curriculum of all staff, then all will wish to know who is conducting the orchestra, and from which score. It is certainly not a matter of one-way communication, but of mutual and reciprocal accommodation. For example, "the language of worship cannot escape the impact of all the other aspects of the civilization within which it lives and changes...What happens in politics, philosophy, science, customs, art, fashions, affects the way believers perceive their faith."[71]

Such a view of the seamless web or the total interconnectedness of Catholic education is not new. In his *De Doctrina Christiana* Augustine had said that " all subjects (must) be surveyed in the light of being connected with one another, and they cannot be understood except in the light of those interconnections."[72] And Aquinas (for example, in *De Veritate*) had spoken of the synergy and interaction among our powers, such that anything happening to the body happens to the person and anything happening to the soul affects the body.[73] Joseph Evans comments that

> none of these powers proceeds on its own laissez-faire way independent of the others...Engaged in common are the intellect and the imagination and the powers of desire, love and emotion. In their operation they influence each other and involve one another.[74]

More recently Kevin Nichols has again articulated the importance of recognizing the overall unity of the various constituent elements (for instance, scripture, doctrine, liturgy, morality) within a religious view of life and the way that this means we cannot truly understand the parts of a system without reference to the wider whole in which they are situated.[75]

> Elements in a system interact with each other, mesh, support, and affect each other. They stand in each other's light...Something which has a function within a system may be unintelligible outside it.[76]

A Catholic philosophy of education should promote among a school staff a concern for maintaining a unified approach to and vision of the educational enterprise. It should help them to avoid incoherence in the curriculum and fragmentation in the pursuit of separate spheres of knowledge, but it should combine this with a degree of sensitivity to the respective jurisdiction and scope of the various subjects within the curriculum. As Nichols comments, "it is not the business of religion or theology to go trampling over other people's gardens."[77]

This whole emphasis on the interconnectedness of a Catholic view of education still leaves unresolved several questions. Some of these echo questions posed by the philosopher of education Jane Roland Martin.

> Is a curriculum incomplete when it is not a unified whole or when it is not inclusive? Is it disconnected when its various subjects are unrelated to one another or when it does not connect up with student needs and purposes? Does it lack meaning when there is

> no unifying principle or theme to give the various subjects significance or when the subjects are not meaningful to students? Does it lack integration when the various parts are not tied together or when new knowledge and different perspectives are not incorporated in it?[78]

The interconnectedness - or the organic nature - of all aspects of education which I have touched upon in this section surely does provide a way of seeing how it might be possible to hold together the three themes or key elements in a Catholic philosophy of education which have been referred to earlier in this chapter: the integral development of the human person, the autonomy of the disciplines and the synthesis of faith and culture. In response to Martin's questions I attempt in chapters five and six to relate the interconnectedness aspect of a distinctively Catholic approach to education to the openness and inclusiveness she mentions. In these two chapters I argue for both an inclusive pedagogy and an appropriation by pupils of living tradition as essential elements within a Catholic education.

Before that, in the next chapter, I will argue that a proper appreciation of the notion of personhood, in particular, personhood as seen in the light of Christ, will help my response to Martin's questions and show the coherence of the three key principles which have been at the heart of this chapter. The argument will be developed further to illuminate how the distinctiveness of the Catholic philosophy of education necessarily involves a degree of exclusivity, for built into the holistic and integrated approach within Catholicism there is also a dialectic between accommodation and openness to the world on the one hand and, on the other hand, resistance to and struggle against it. This dialectic, which involves a constant creative tension between development and discipline in our lives, helps to clarify both the distinctiveness and the exclusiveness within Catholic educational philosophy. By clarifying what Catholic education is for, it will be easier to see how - and why - it must resist some

alternative perspectives which are incompatible with it, for example, those implicit within the philosophy of the "market", with its attendant features of individualism, utilitarianism and materialism.[79]

3.3.1 Von Hügel

In anticipation of my claim that it *is* possible to combine distinctiveness with inclusiveness and as an exemplification of how this chapter's key themes (integral human development, autonomous disciplines, a synthesis of faith, life and culture and the need for interconnectedness) can be interpreted and understood in such a way that they mutually support and illuminate one another, I draw upon the personal example and writings of Baron Friedrich von Hügel (1852-1925).[80] With an aristocratic Scottish mother and an Austrian diplomat as father, von Hügel spent his early life in various European cities, gaining a cosmopolitan perspective and a facility in several languages before settling down for most of his adult life in England. He did not study at university, although he was a dedicated scholar. He wrote as an amateur autodidact freed from academic institutional ties (and their associated duties) in the liberal atmosphere of a still securely Anglican England, where Catholics were in a tiny minority. This well-connected layman combined several roles in his wide range of contacts and through his many interests and extended span of correspondence: he was a biblical critic, religious historian, philosopher of religion, spiritual director and ecumenist. Unfortunately, he has been almost completely neglected in the literature on Catholic education despite the fact that he has a wealth of insights worth drawing upon. Despite the great respect with which he was held, especially among Christians beyond his own communion, it is only fair to record that he failed in his own lifetime to convince many of his fellow Catholics to attend carefully to his version of an integrated and well-rounded Catholicism.[81]

This may be due, in part, to the fact that, although a devout and loyal member of the church, he prized his independence from any particular party-line. He also participated significantly, both in his own right and in a mediating role, in the very lively debates of his time, especially those relating to the church's difficulties in establishing a satisfactory accommodation with the insights of modern thinking. The modernist movement in the Catholic Church at the beginning of the twentieth century sought to reinterpret Catholic thought in the light of current theories from historical, biblical, scientific and philosophical studies. Von Hügel, being a polymath, delved into all these areas and applied them to his reflections on the church and religious life. In doing so, he did not confine himself to the familiar categories employed by specialists in any particular discipline, thereby making himself suspect, either of religious unorthodoxy or of not being a serious scholar. This was compounded by his evident sympathy for several figures in the modernist movement who were condemned by the Catholic Church for jettisoning too readily traditional concepts and categories and for slipping into heresy as a result.[82] Perhaps another reason for von Hügel's lack of influence on Catholics in England has been his convoluted and Teutonic style of writing, which showed the influence both of his being brought up in a cosmopolitan and multi-lingual household and of his multi-disciplinary studies. But, if his mind was "laborious, many regarding, fully weighing, slow, deep ploughing,"[83] it certainly yielded insights from which we can still derive much benefit.

Throughout his writings we find a picture of what might be meant by an integral human formation, though this was not a phrase he used himself. The synthesis of faith, culture and life that he hints at is one which displays a dynamic and deep equilibrium. He shows how wholeness, holiness and humanity can be held together, indeed, how they need each other. The themes of richness, fullness, growth, infinite

expansion, abundance, balance and inclusiveness pervade his works. By demonstrating in his own life and writings the importance of balancing the institutional, intellectual and mystical elements of religion, allowing each of these to supplement, stimulate and to purify the other two, and not allowing one element to dominate, he managed to inject warmth, vitality, depth and genuine openness into the picture of what an educated Catholic could be like.[84]

Von Hügel stressed that the church does not have a monopoly of truth and grace, and that God is to be found, and that truth, beauty and goodness are present, in all religions. Such a view was not characteristic of the Catholic Church of his own time, although it was fully in harmony with previously neglected elements of its history. Drawing upon the thought of the Spanish theologian de Lugo (1583-1660), he brought out the universalist side of Catholicism and showed that tolerance did not mean indifference.[85] Von Hügel's tolerance was based first on a humble recognition that we can neither trace nor confine the operations of God's grace in individuals and also in institutions, and second on a trust in the essential good faith and sound religious instinct of people everywhere. Tolerance, then, it might be said, is owed to others because of their basic goodness; it is advisable because Catholics do not possess a monopoly of truth and so should be ready to learn from and be enriched by the insights of others; and it is incumbent on all if we are to be open to the universal and inscrutable ways of God. He opposed the heresy-hunting mentality which prevailed in his church in the first few years of this century and set himself resolutely against the narrowness, suspicion, timidity and controversial spirit which he deplored among his fellow Catholics. He had learnt from the Parisian priest Huvelin that it is possible to remain deeply believing while remaining open-eyed about difficulties.[86] He did not water down the church's teaching on the transcendence of God, the divinity of Jesus, the need for institutional adherence, the objective claims for

doctrinal truth, or the costliness of religious life, but he combined this embrace of the 'otherness' of religious faith with an openness to the non-religious dimensions of life.

3.3.2 Our need of the non-religious dimensions

One of the most important and pervading themes in von Hügel's works is the need, for the sake of our religious health, as much as for the health of the rest of our personality, for the proper development of all the other, non-religious dimensions of our being, our physical, emotional, aesthetic, social and intellectual growth. The multiplicity of our inner life provides the necessary materials, stimulants, interactions and obstacles from which richness, balance and harmony can emerge.[87]

> Catholicism will have to recognise, respect, love and protect the non-religious levels and complexes of life, as also coming from God as occasions, materials, stimulations, necessary for us men towards the development of our complete humanity, and especially of our religion...These various stages and ranges possess their own immanent laws and conditions of existence and growth, and deserve our love and service in this their nature and development.[88]

The body and the senses have a crucial role here for von Hügel. In his view epistemology and psychology combine in showing us that we need the stimulation of the senses for the awakening of our spiritual awareness.[89] If God is only apprehended only in, with and on occasion of, yet also in contrast to, other realities (a fact, von Hügel believes, that obtains in knowledge of any kind that we claim to have) then we must fill our lives with a wide range of interests, for their own sake and for our spiritual development.[90] The body is not the enemy of the spirit, but "the stimulator and spring-board, the material and training ground" for it, and through its agency we must "strive to awaken and utilise" every aspect of life, with its special

characteristics, "in its right place and degree, for the calling into full action of all the rest."[91]

By taking the Incarnation of Christ as a model for our appreciation of how the human and the divine can coexist, rather than be seen as opponents, von Hügel combines belief in sacramentality, mediation and communion, features later identified by McBrien as constituting the essence of Catholicism. "Typical growth in religious depth and fruitfulness is not a growth away from the stimulations, occasions, concomitants, vehicles and expressions of sense."[92] Nature is not driven out or destroyed by grace; it is built on and transformed.

The different spheres of life all have their part to play. It is right and proper to encourage people to cultivate, rather than to deflect their attention away from, an interest in politics, economics, language, history, science and philosophy.[93] These various levels in life contribute to each other. Therefore we should study religion both together with and apart from them, since the presence of God "underlies, environs, protects and perfects all the lesser realities."[94]

Presumably von Hügel wished to preserve two values here: the mutual illumination and stimulus offered when subjects are studied together or in each other's light and yet also the necessity to protect the separate identity and relative autonomy of each, so that it can be truly itself rather than merely the handservant of another discipline. He jealously defended the rights of historians and scientists to operate freely and according to their own methodology, with a right to their own sphere of jurisdiction, and without interference from theologians or church authorities.

> Religion is not directly either Ethics or Philosophy, Economics or Art, yet at the peril of emptiness and sterility, it has to move out into, to learn from, to criticize, and to teach, all these other apprehensions and activities.[95]

Theology may well be the crowning discipline but this does not entail crippling or distorting the others; rather it means adopting an open and inclusive attitude towards them. Such openness, while recognising the genuine insights, values and truths contained in other disciplines, does not disallow theology the right to indicate their limitations or where they might need complementing.[96] Similarly theologians will benefit from the perspectives and insights gained through deep immersion in other disciplines. In von Hügel's view we should neither

> sacrifice religion to these activities or these activities to religion...God is the God of the body as he is of the soul; of science as he is of faith; of criticism and theory as of fact and reality.[97]

Furthermore,

> This source and sustenance [God] of the other realities is apprehended by us ever with, and in, and over against, those other, various realities that impinge upon our many-levelled lives...Religion has the...task of ever respecting, whilst ever more harmonizing, purifying, and utilizing, each and all of these various realms.[98]

In my treatment of post Vatican II thinking on Catholic education I have noted the existence of some tension between the principles which seek to hold together a concern for the autonomy of the disciplines, the synthesis between culture and faith and development of the critical faculties of students as part of their integral formation. A study of the works of von Hügel provides a welcome filling out of these principles and an example of their application. No one brings out more clearly than he does the essential interconnections between these principles.

As von Hügel is keen to remind us, "man is not a mere sum-total of water-tight compartments. " For, although the various areas of knowledge "have to be discovered and treated according to the principles and methods immanent and special to that department," their insights must be brought to bear upon each other.[99] For example,

> science will help to discipline, humble, purify the natural eagerness and wilfulness, the cruder forms of anthropomorphism, of the human mind and heart. (It) will help to give depth and mystery, drama and pathos, a rich spirituality, to the whole experience and conception of the soul and of life, of the world and of God...Crush out, or in any way mutilate or deautonomize this part, and all the rest will suffer.[100]

There will be similar gains which flow from serious study of all the disciplines, since they offer insights into real and essential aspects of our nature and our world.

> However much man may be supremely and finally a religious animal, he is not only that; but he is a physical and sexual, a fighting and an artistic, a domestic and social, a political and philosophical animal as well.[101]

3.3.3 Friction

Von Hügel was well aware that it would be no easy task to bring all these different parts of our personality into some kind of harmony. Integral human development could not happen without much friction, cost and pain.[102] The 'midwifery of pain' was treated by him as 'inseparable from the birth and rebirth of a personality'.[103] He was convinced, to a degree that puzzled his closest friends, that to experience our nature as internally discordant was both normal and necessary for our human and spiritual growth.[104] The different energies and needs within us and the various opportunities and environments pressing upon us were bound to conflict with one another, to cause friction, tension and to co-exist in an uneasy rivalry[105]

The theme of friction and its place in our development recurs frequently throughout all of von Hügel's writings. The friction within us which is caused by the mutual chafing of the different parts of our personality serves several functions. Sometimes it prevents religion from overstraining us by forcing us to develop another part of ourselves, perhaps a part that had been neglected in our attempts to meet religious requirements.[106] Sometimes the sheer 'non-fit', the 'otherness' of, for example, science or religion, one to another, forces us to make room within us for a perception which transcends our previous categories or exceeds the bounds of inadequate language.[107] At other times, the purpose of the inner friction which we experience stems from the fact that "the primary function of religion is not the consoling of the natural man as it finds him, but the purification of this man, by effecting an ever-growing cleavage and contrast between his bad false self, and ...his true good self."[108]

Clearly von Hügel has a rich understanding of the complexity of our inner lives and of our need for guidance which will ensure that we do not become unbalanced by particular enthusiasms of our own or by the demands of others. Among the various possible avenues we could travel in life we must be prevented from pursuing any path, including the religious one, too far or too soon, lest we be ill-equipped or unready for the journey and its eventual rigours. Some of the tensions and frictions from which we suffer will be experienced as the conflicting calls of the senses versus the spirit, or of the past versus the present, or of the institutional versus the individual.[109] No matter, for we need all of these tensions to enter into us, to recognise the call, which comes from beyond our own little worlds, through these experiences, to wake up and to allow ourselves to be enlarged in consciousness and character. In this process, which is part of what continual conversion entails, there will be a combination of correction and confirmation: some elements in our nature and habits need to be either

curbed or reshaped, while others deserve and will receive a strengthening or boosting of their natural powers.[110]

One of the ways that von Hügel's perspective reflects an emphasis more prevalent in his own era than in ours is the notion of life as a testing ground for the growth of personality, as a seedbed for the emergence of spirit, as a training school of sanctity.[111] In the scheme of things heroism is called for and this only comes through facing real struggle.

> Real temptation, true piercing conflict, heavy darkness, and bewildering perplexity...risks of failing and falling: all this forms an essential part of this painful-joyous probation and virile, because necessarily costing and largely gradual, self-constitution of man's free-willing spirit.[112]

Some of this is reminiscent of Teilhard de Chardin's language on the need for God to work in us through our passivities as well as through our activities, through what we undergo as well as through what we achieve via effort. Teilhard was no more being morbid than von Hugel in making allowance for the dark side of life.[113] Von Hügel acknowledges a role for asceticism as a valid and, indeed, essential and constituent part of the Christian outlook, despite the apparent hardness of this viewpoint and despite the combat and concentration it requires of us to follow this way.[114]

Finally, there is another, perhaps surprising, dimension to the role of friction in our lives. Part of its value lies in the challenge it throws out to the religious dimension in us. Our very church allegiance will find itself checked, purified, steadied and sobered - and therefore made more wholesome - by the struggles faith has with the institution of the church.[115] For the church needs to learn from and to be enriched by our tussle with it, just as we will benefit enormously by being ready to receive the wisdom

and training it offers to us. And this is where those other, non-religious, elements of life come into their own. For

> religion will have to come to see that it cannot attain to its own depth, it cannot become the chief thing, if it does not continually renounce to aspiring after being everything.[116]

3.3.4 Church affiliation and inclusiveness

Von Hügel has shown - although he does not use these terms - some of the depths of what might be meant by integral human development and also the contributory role played in this development by both the autonomy of the different subjects or disciplines and the synthesis of faith and culture. He also exemplifies how one can combine a firm commitment to a church with a genuine openness to people with different convictions and institutional affiliations.

The first mistake to avoid, he would claim, is any attempt at complete identification of the visible with the invisible church. This would be incompatible with Catholicism.[117] Only God can read men's hearts; no earthly institution, even the church, has yet reached perfection; and God's Spirit may dwell in, but it also transcends his church.

A second mistake would be to have an unbalanced or excessive veneration for the authority of the church. Von Hügel is convinced that such authority is an absolutely essential factor assisting in the soul's growth, but, even so, it still only constitutes part, not the whole, of our religious life. One must also be realistic, open and honest about the shortcomings of that authority.

> Official Authority is ever repetitive of something past and gone; is the voice of the average thoughts of the many; aims at limiting the action of its subjects to a passive reception and more or less mechanical execution of its commands; is essentially timid; cares necessarily more for the outward appearances and material output, than for the interior disposition and form of the soul's activity; maps out the very phenomenal world into visible, mutually exclusive regions of spiritual light and darkness.[118]

This recognition of such shortcomings does not seem to have undermined von Hügel's loyalty to his church in any way. In his view, with the combination of features which co-exist within the church there will be value for our spiritual lives in both the prudent and the daring sides of her character, when she is being conservative and when she is being creative, even if we are not able to appreciate one or other of these features at the time we experience them. And, of course we must acknowledge, von Hügel points out, that

> church officials are no more the whole church...than Scotland Yard or the War Office or the House of Lords, though admittedly necessary parts of the national life, are the whole, or average samples, of the life and fruitfulness of the English nation.[119]

Thus we have a concept of von Hügel's commitment to the church, which is firm and unwavering,[120] alert to the riches she offered and ready to accept the discipline she imposed, but also open-eyed as regards her limitations. He was also open-minded about and ready to learn from other faiths which he recognised and appreciated as having elements of truth and light in them even though he could not accept that they were all equally true. The Catholic church's claim to universality should in no way lead to intolerance.[121]

Von Hügel's openness and sensitive approach to people of other Christian denominations led him, when they asked his advice, to take great care not to pressurise them to become Catholics, lest they did so when they were not ready and, in doing so, disturbed their own equilibrium and ended up in a worse state than they were in before leaving behind their former religious affiliation. Souls outside the church were not lost; they were safe with God, wherever they were. Instead of an excessive urge to win converts as rapidly and in as large numbers as possible, rather he sought to strengthen and deepen whatever beliefs (however tentative) and whatever religious practice (however tenuous a hold in their lives) they already had.[122] Part of his caution against too zealous an attempt to proselytise others stemmed from the harm he felt he had done, the confusion he had sown and the disturbance he had caused for some of his friends and even to members of his own family by sharing too readily and forcefully his own religious position and convictions.

This caution led him to adopt a balanced approach to others who were seeking religious guidance. He advocated a way that was "fervent without fanaticism," one that combined an encouraging and a sympathetic approach without displaying an indifference to the claims of his own faith.[123] In this openness to people who were not fellow Catholics, von Hügel was out of step with the prevailing ethos of his church. It can justifiably be claimed that he was a forerunner of that more positive and ecumenical attitude towards other Christians and to adherents of other faiths which emerged at Vatican II. A fortress Catholicism, with its temptation to exert a military discipline over its members and to display a closed and defensive mentality in the face of criticism, was uncongenial to him.

Von Hügel did not use either of those phrases which we have seen are central to the current Catholic understanding of the goal of education, namely 'integral development of the human person' and 'synthesis of faith, culture, and life.' Nevertheless, it will be apparent, from the presentation I have given of his thought, that he offers a rich and nuanced appreciation of their meaning. In his own work it is clear that both integral development and the desired synthesis depend upon those other features to which he gave such emphasis: openness to the truth wherever it was to be found, respect for the autonomy of the disciplines and a nurturing of the critical faculties of both the already committed faithful and those who still sought a religious home. If we are open to the differences between people and ourselves, if we welcome their 'otherness' and the particularity they present to us, if we are genuinely inclusive, we will adapt ourselves to their needs.[124] Such inclusiveness and openness, together with the freedom of manoeuvre, flexibility and responsiveness that follow from them, are built upon the confidence, the inner sense of security and stability and the settled conviction of one who stands on firm ground. Von Hügel demonstrates in his work that it is possible, within the parameters of a Catholic perspective, to combine distinctiveness and inclusiveness. These two qualities are not mutually exclusive, but maintaining a creative tension between them will be a complex and costly exercise.

Notes and references for chapter three

[1]*Gravissimum Educationis*, in Abbott, Walter, ed, *The Documents of Vatican II*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1967, p.639.

[2]*Ibid.* p.645. (in a footnote)

[3]The primacy given to parents in the education of their children was a prominent theme in papal teachings of the inter-war years, in response to collectivist and totalitarian ideologies of both the right and the left.

[4]I say more on salvation in chapter four.

[5]*Gravissimum Educationis*, pp.641, 646, 648.

[6]*Ibid.* p.639. Michael Bayldon, (in '*Gravissimum Educationis* 30 Years on', *New Blackfriars*, March 1996, pp.131 - 136,) is critical of the conflation of Catholic education to Catholic schooling , in much of the literature since the Council and to the neglect of other aspects of the Church's involvement in human development, in particular, the value of faith development activities which facilitate intergenerational encounter and learning.

[7]Gregory XVI stated in *Mirari vos* (1832) that "from the most foul well of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous opinion, or rather delirium, of liberty of conscience...But what death is worse for the soul than the freedom to err?" quoted in Kamen, H, *The Rise of Toleration*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967, p.241. Pius IX, in 1864, completely rejected the idea that "the Roman pontiff can, and ought to, reconcile himself to, and agree with, progress, liberalism, and modern civilization." quoted in Dulles, Avery, *Models of the Church* Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1974, p.84.

[8]The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1977, pp.10,11.

[9]Anthony Bryk, Valerie Lee and Peter Holland, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1993; Marcellin Flynn, *The Culture of Catholic Schools*, Homebush, (Australia), St Pauls, 1993; Catholic Education Service, *Quality in Catholic Schools*, London, 1995; Catholic Education Service, *Learning from OFSTED and Diocesan Inspections*, London, 1996; Catholic Education Service, *A Struggle for Excellence*, London, 1997; Andrew Morris's five articles: (i) 'The academic performance of Catholic schools', *School Organisation*, vol. 14, 1994, pp.81-89, (ii) 'The Catholic school ethos; its effect on post-16 student academic achievement', *Educational Studies*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1995, pp.67-83, (iii) 'Same Mission, Same Methods, Same Results?', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, December 1997, pp.378-391, (iv) So Far, So Good: levels of academic achievement in Catholic schools', *Educational Studies*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1998, pp.83-94, (v) 'Catholic and other secondary schools: an analysis of OFSTED inspection reports', *Educational Research*, vol. 40, no. 2, 1998.

[10]*The Catholic School*, pp.8,13.

[11]*Ibid.* pp.7,12,13.

[12]*Ibid.* p.14.

[13]*Ibid.*

[14]*Ibid.* p.15. cf. Dawson, *Crisis*, pp.138-9.

[15]For example, see Walbert Buhlmann, *With Eyes to See*, Slough, St Paul Publications, 1990, chapters 5 - 7, which deal with Latin America, Africa, Asia and Euramerica respectively. Also, see Aylward Shorter, *Toward a Theology of Inculturation*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1988. Michael Paul Gallagher, *(Clashing Symbols*, London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1997, p.104.) points out that "Just as the gospel casts new light on each human situation, those situations in turn can bring different dimensions of the gospel into new life." He attributes the new emphasis on inculturation to "a new awareness from anthropology of the dignity and diversity of cultures; a more developed theology of the presence and action of the Spirit in all cultures, and a recognition that evangelization is a two-way process of double conversion or mutual enrichment: the faith horizon of the evangelizer is also transformed and challenged through contact with a different culture." Thomas Hughson, *The Believer As Citizen*, New Jersey, Paulist Press, 1993, says (p.112) that "inculturation is a theological version of what Gadamer describes as 'application' in the symbiosis of everyday understanding/interpretation/application." He describes it (p.113) as "the process of engaging all that Christianity essentially is and does with the cultural reality of a local (regional, linguistic, or national) church." In this process there will be three (successive) stages: translation, assimilation and transformation.

[16]In 1997 the Sri Lankan theologian Tissa Balasuriya was excommunicated as a result of criticisms of his attempt to re-interpret aspects of Christian theology and to relate them to the thought forms of Asian cultures and experience. This excommunication was lifted a year later.

[17]By appropriating the notion of living tradition for the academic and community life of the school and by extending the notion of differentiation to the realm of religious education and worship, pupils will be helped to develop their own response to and expression of the religious tradition, rather than be expected to conform to it unthinkingly or to assimilate it uncritically. This process will also have to take into account the diverse levels of familiarity with and commitment to the Catholic tradition prevalent among pupils (as well their parents and the staff). I explore further the relevance of differentiation applied to the religious realm within Catholic schools and the educational implications of appropriating living tradition in chapters five and six.

[18]For recent guidance which exemplifies that combination of distinctiveness and inclusiveness, as constituent features of Catholic education, which I am advocating in this thesis, see Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *Catholic Schools & Other Faiths*, Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1997.

[19]For a clear, penetrating and balanced study of changing Church-State relations over educational matters in the UK, one which covers the period right up the late 1990s, see Priscilla Chadwick, *Shifting Alliances*, London, Cassell, 1997. Gerald Grace also brings out very sharply, from the perspective of headteachers in Catholic schools and

in other schools, some of the value clashes and dilemmas arising from government policy and legislation relating to education in the 1980s and 1990s in his *School Leadership*, London, Falmer Press, 1995.

[20]*The Catholic School*, p. 15.

[21]"Theology is imperialistic when it attempts to exert absolute domination over an area of reality which is not properly its own." It "consists in the absorption by theology of sectors of reality inappropriate to it." James Michael Lee, 'Religious education and theology', in *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation*, edited by Jeff Astley, Leslie Francis and Colin Crowder, Leominster, Gracewing, 1996, p.66. I think Lee overstates his case against theology (in favour of a social science foundation for religious education) and that his comment (loc.cit., p.53.) "theological theory simply lacks the capability to explain, predict and verify nontheological realms of being, such as teaching, dentistry, politics, economics, loving and the like", requires the qualification 'adequately' before the verb 'explain'. On the autonomy of the secular, see *Gaudium et Spes*, para 36, and Patrick Hannon, *Church, State, Morality & Law*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1992, p.55.

[22]Haldane, 'Philosophy and Catholic Education', *The Sower*, April 1995, p.30. where he goes on to say: "the belief that each human being is called to the service of God should inform, though not exhaust, one's understanding of historical events." Similarly, he continues, with regard to the study of mathematics, without distortion of the autonomy of the subject one could examine the "intelligible structures" of the world opened up through the subject with a view to the possibility that through an understanding of them we are "reaching out towards the mind of God."

[23]*Ibid.*

[24]For a collection of essays exploring a Catholic understanding of history, see *Eternity in Time*, edited by Stratford Caldecott and John Morrill, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1997. This study of Christopher Dawson and the Catholic idea of history deserves careful consideration from all teachers of history in Catholic schools. For Dawson's summary of the traditional Christian conception of history, see his *Crisis*, p.163.

[25]Paddy Walsh provides two helpful clarifications of some of the issues at stake here. First, from *Education and Meaning : Philosophy in Practice*, (London, Cassell, 1993), in a section entitled 'Basing Values on Love of the World' he emphasizes the intrinsic value of persons, objects and aspects of the world. These have "value in themselves as a condition of being values for us." (p.113). Such a positive reading of the world leads to Walsh seeking to redress the traditional downgrading of art and technical education (to the advantage of propositional knowledge) and the neglect of ethical, political, legal, economic, ecological and family studies. In his appropriation of Aristotelian categories (theory, techne, praxis) for our own context and time, Walsh offers a holistic vision of and programme for education. In the process he challenges the blanket dismissal of the instrumental and the suspicion of the material, (p.167) without slipping into instrumentalism or materialism. Second, in an earlier essay, 'The church secondary school and its curriculum' (Donal O'Leary (ed) *Religious Education and Young Adults*, Slough, St Paul Publications, 1983, pp.4 - 19) Walsh

explores the possibility of the curriculum addressing Christian culture, for example through selecting examples of Christian faith expressed in art, music, and literature, as well as allowing a place for both contemplation (where science, for example, can be considered as 'food for the soul') and concern, for example in the context of geography, technology and social studies.

[26]*The Catholic School*, p.18.

[27]"The central, distinctive concern of theology is precisely the interrelatedness of things that, for 350 years, the academy has preferred to keep separate." Stephen Toulmin, 'Theology in the context of the university', in Astley, Francis and Crowder (1996), *op.cit.*, p.403.

[28]John Paul II, *Catechesi Tradendae*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1979, para 5.

[29]*Ibid.*. paras 43, 67.

[30]*Ibid.*, para 69.

[31]*Ibid.*, para 15.

[32]*Ibid.*, 7, 13, 18.

[33]See section 3.3.3 on von Hugel and friction.

[34]*Catechesi Tradendae*, para 17.

[35]*Ibid.*

[36]*Ibid.*, para 47.

[37]*Ibid.*, paras 29, 32.

[38]*Ibid.*, paras 38, 49, 53, 59, 92.

[39]The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *Lay Catholics in Schools : Witnesses to Faith*, (London, Catholic Truth Society, 1982), pp.8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17.

[40]*Ibid.* pp.17,18.

[41]*Ibid.* pp.22, 24, 33, 34, 35, 41.

[42]*Ibid.*

[43]Newman, J.H., *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, introduced by Nicholas Lash, London, University of Notre Dame Press, 1979, p.89. Newman, in another memorable passage, says: "One little deed, done against natural inclination for God's sake, though in itself of a conceding or passive character, to brook an insult, to face a danger, or to resign an advantage, has in it a power outbalancing all the dust and chaff of mere profession." (*University Sermons*, introduced by D.M. MacKinnon and J.D. Holmes, London, SPCK, 1970, p. 93.) Newman devotes a whole sermon to the theme of 'Personal Influence, the Means of Propagating the Truth'. He continues (*ibid.*, p.95) :"the attraction exerted by unconscious holiness is of an urgent and irresistible nature; it persuades the weak, the timid, the wavering, and the inquiring; it draws forth the affection and loyalty of all who are in a measure like-minded; and over the thoughtless or perverse multitude it exercises a sovereign sway."

[44]*University Sermons*, p.94.

[45]The Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School,* (London, Catholic Truth Society, 1988), p.26.

[46]*Ibid.*, quoting from a 1982 speech by Pope John Paul II.

[47]*Ibid.* pp.26, 29, 30, 56.

[48]*Ibid.*p.43. See also p.48. For a more detailed treatment of the human person, see chapter four.

[49]*Ibid.* p.49.

[50]*Ibid.* p.3.

[51]For a powerful push in this direction, one which challenged Catholic schools to be more humane places which reflect the Gospel spirit of freedom and love, see Purnell, P, *Our Faith Story*, London, Collins, 1985.

[52]This is discussed further in 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and in chapter 4.

[53]Cf. the claim made by John Redden and Francis Ryan:" The only complete, adequate, natural way of thought is scholastic philosophy." *A Catholic Philosophy of Education* (Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956, p.vii.) Such a claim could not, with justification, have been made by mainstream Catholic writers after the Second Vatican Council. The present Pope, John Paul II, without repudiating the insights and values of scholasticism, nevertheless is heavily influenced by and steeped in phenomenology and Christian personalism. See *At the Centre of the Human Drama: The Philosophical Anthropology of Karol Wojtyla/Pope John Paul II*, by Kenneth Schmitz (The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, 1993). Official teaching of the Catholic church about, for example, sex education and co-education has become much more positive and less defensive than it was in Pius XI's encyclical *Divini Illius Magistri/On Christian Education of Youth*, (in *Selected Papal Encyclicals and letters*, Vol 1, 1896 - 1931, London, CTS, 1939, pp.31-32.) Mary Boys' plea that for the curriculum to be truly 'Catholic' it must become more 'catholic' -"more inclusive of cross-cultural perspectives...(and take into account) the experiences of men and women... people of colour and other 'marginal' voices" - clearly reflects modern concerns. (*Educating In Faith : Maps and Visions,* San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1989, p.212.) Whether it is seen as accidental or central to Catholic education; or merely an extension of what has already been agreed to be central, it is evidently focussed on this world rather than the next. cf Redden and Ryan's language, where the emphasis is different (although not in direct contradiction): "The end of Catholic education...is the supernatural life of grace and the achievement of eternal life, of everlasting happiness, of membership in the kingdom of God. All the other ends are subordinated to this one end. Catholic education is not primarily concerned with physical well-being, nor with the accumulation of wealth, knowledge, power, culture, worldly prestige, or social efficiency. While all these have their place and value, and should receive proper recognition, nevertheless, they are not primary, but incidental; not ends, but means to the major purpose of life." (*Ibid.* p.174.) When they speak of the aims of the curriculum Redden and Ryan do include this-worldly concerns but they begin thus: "The curriculum must guide the individual toward an appreciation and understanding

of the doctrines of holy Church." (*Ibid.* p.330.) Cf the rather different emphasis of David Konstant, in the report *Signposts and Homecomings*, on behalf of the Catholic bishops of England and Wales (Slough, St Paul Publications, 1981). On page 138 four features which arise out of belief in Jesus Christ as the universal saviour are picked out: 1) "the communication of a Christian spiritual perspective of the meaning of life; 2) a special respect for the baptised of all ages and concern for their individuality and integrity; 3) a dedication to the pursuit of justice; and 4) the promotion of a sense of mission."(see also pp.119-121.) A few pages further on we are told that the four purposes of Catholic education are: "1) the communication of a perspective of human life centred in Jesus Christ; 2) a respect for the individuality and integrity of all; 3) concern with education for freedom, proceeding by way of illumination rather than indoctrination; and 4) promotion of a sense of justice and of mission." (Ibid. p.143.) The third of these, with its concern to promote freedom and to avoid indoctrination would have been unfamiliar, if not alien, until fairly recently within Catholic circles.

[54]Konstant, *op.cit.*, p.121. At the heart of Christian faith is the belief that "in Christ all things hold together" (Colossians 1:17) and that therefore a Christian should "take every thought captive for Christ" (2 Corinthians 10:5). Relationship with Christ requires radical conversion in our thinking and lifestyle, without which we cannot appreciate the salvation he offers. "The unspiritual man does not receive the gifts of the Spirit of God, for they are folly to him, and he is not able to understand them". (1 Corinthians 2:14) For further biblical references asserting the centrality of Christ in a Christian's understanding of self and world, see Matthew 28: 18-20; the prologue to John's Gospel; John 14:6; Ephesians 1:9-10; 1 Timothy 2:5.

[55]Konstant, *ibid.*

[56]G.K. Chesterton, *The Common Man,* (London, Sheed and Ward, 1950), pp.167-8. *cf.* Newman, *Idea of a University*, op.cit., pp.50, 51, 134, 137. on the interconnectedness of knowledge.

[57]For the wider importance of the notion of coherence in any form of education - and also as a constituent element in personal identity - , see Jeffrey Morgan, 'A Defence of Autonomy as an Educational Ideal', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 30, no. 2, July 1996, pp.245, 251. Morgan distinguishes consistency, where there is an effort to avoid conflict, from coherence, where the parts of something fit together and provide mutual support. *Cf.* the analysis of consistency and coherence in education offered by Buchman and Floden. The two concepts have several resemblances. "First, both satisfy the sensible criterion of nonfragmentation in the curriculum or the requirement that it should not be a collection of small bits and pieces. Denoting connectedness, coherence and consistency share, second, a status of relative terms, for understanding each depends on some clarity about what is supposed to 'hang together' with what else, how, in what aspects, and to what ends. Connoting order, unity, and intelligibility, the concepts of coherence and consistency carry finally, similar positive implications of value. Despite their resemblances, however, these two concepts are not interchangeable. Thus, while *consistency* implies logical relations and the absence of contradictions, *coherence* allows for many

kinds of connectedness, encompassing logic, but also associations of ideas and feelings, intimations of resemblance, conflicts and tensions previsagements and imaginative leaps." pp.222-223. *Detachment and Concern*, edited by Buchman and Floden, London, Cassell, 1993. If the programme offered to pupils should be consistent, there should still be room for individual creative interpretation and response on their part. This means that teachers should take care not to impose an integrating framework which is so strong that it inhibits pupil initiative.

[58]Mary Boys, *op. cit.*, p.134. [quoting from Michael O'Neill, "Toward a Modern Concept of Permeation," *Momentum*, 10 (May, 1979), p.49] As an alternative to 'permeate', Boys also suggests the term 'suffuse' as one that is appropriate to the way Catholic principles will touch upon or be relevant to all areas of study. *Ibid.* The notion of 'culture' is more commonly used now than that of 'permeation' in the context of a prevailing educational philosophy. For an application of this to Catholic schooling, see Marcellin Flynn, *The Culture of Catholic Schools*, Homebush, Australia, St Pauls, 1993. For the relevance of current understandings of culture to theology generally, see Kathryn Tanner, *Theories of Culture*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1997; and for the most recent and institutionally authoritative treatment of the relevance of an understanding of culture for Catholic education, understood broadly, see *General Directory for Catechesis*, Congregation for the Clergy, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1997.

[59]Michael Himes, 'Catholicism as Integral Humanism : Christian Participation in Pluralistic Moral Education,' in *The Challenge of Pluralism*, edited by F. Clark Power and Daniel K. Lapsley, (University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), p.130.

[60]See Himes, *loc. cit.*, p.132.

[61]Himes, *loc. cit.*, p.133. For an indication of how Christianity can be related to the curriculum and how many subjects can be open to a religious dimension, see Kevin Williams, 'Religion, Culture and Schooling,' in *From Ideal to Action*, edited by Matthew Feheney, Dublin, Veritas, 1998.

[62]See Patrick Hannon, *op.cit.*, p.33 on there being no ultimate separation between service of God and social behaviour.

[63]The true nature of this synthesis is outlined by Gemma Loughran in 'The Rationale of Catholic Education' in *Education and Policy in Northern Ireland*, edited by R. Osborne, R. Cormack & R. Miller, Belfast, Policy Research Institute, 1987, pp.115-122. Loughran argues that a Catholic view of education differs from a secularist philosophy "which insists on an exclusively this-world interpretation and explanation of reality and which therefore dismisses as irrelevant any religious belief", and that it also differs from a philosophy of education which "distinguishes between secular knowledge and a separate realm of religion." She points out that, in contrast with these two views, "the Catholic understanding is of the unity of all knowledge, of the oneness of truth in Christ." *ibid.*, p.117. It might be argued that the dominant Catholic tradition, at least since the central middle ages and over many centuries, has been to allow a greater degree of separation of sacred from secular than has been customary in some of the Protestant traditions. Loughran's emphasis is between a

secular and a Catholic approach to education. It would also hold true for other religious worldviews.

[64]Teachers of different curriculum areas should expect their work to be receptive to the religious atmosphere and worldview on which the school is founded. In this sense they cannot claim to be uninfluenced by it. *The General Directory for Catechesis*, issued (from Rome) by the Congregation for the Clergy at the end of 1997, reiterates the importance of interdisciplinary dialogue in Catholic schools being prompted by religious instruction. "In this way the presentation of the Christian message influences the way in which the origins of the world, the sense of history, the basis of ethical values, the function of religion in culture, the destiny of man and his relationship with nature, are understood. Through inter-disciplinary dialogue religious instruction in schools underpins, develops and completes the educational activity of the school." London, Catholic Truth Society, 1997, p.74.

[65]Ronald Nelson's essay 'Faith Discipline Integration: Compatibilist, Reconstructionalist, and Transformationalist Strategies' (from *The Reality of Christian Learning*, edited by H. Heie and D. Wolfe, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Eerdmans Publishing, 1987, pp.317-339 has influenced several other recent Reformed critiques of Christian education, including, for example, some of the work of Ken Badley ('The Faith/Learning Integration Movement in Christian Higher Education : Slogan or Substance?', *Journal of Research in Christian Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, Spring 1994, pp.13-33 and 'Two "Cop-Outs" in Faith-Learning Integration', *Spectrum*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1996, pp.105-118) and several of the essays in *Agenda for Educational Change*, edited by John Shortt & Trevor Cooling, Leicester, Apollos, 1997.

[66]On these three approaches see Nelson, *loc.cit.*, pp.317, 325, 329 and *Agenda*, pp.13, 88, 175 It is interesting to note that, in this analysis, Nelson relies heavily on Lonergan: first, with regard to his epistemology, in his treatment of the conditions of our knowing; second, borrowing Lonergan's analysis of how our mental horizons are modified by the flooding into our lives of the unearned and unconditional love of God; and third, drawing heavily on Lonergan's analysis of the nature and effects of conversion and how this relates to our capacity for knowledge. For reference to two studies of the relevance of Lonergan's work to education, see chapter two, note 61. The use of 'reconstruction' by Christian writers from the reformed tradition is quite different from that of Dewey or Freire, which refers to reflection upon and interrogation of experience, to processing of knowledge and to consideration of its application in personal and social projects.

[67]In the light of the 'hermeneutics of suspicion' as practised throughout the last hundred years, we are also now more conscious of the ideological functioning of forms of belief and of disciplines, with vested interests being promoted and defended and with potentially 'awkward' perspectives occluded.

[68]To emphasize the importance of personal example raises questions about a Christian understanding of personhood. A teacher cannot model 'accidentally' a form of life about which she has no deep knowledge and in which she has not been formed. See chapter four for a study of human nature and personhood which does justice to a Catholic perspective.

[69]Badley, (1996), *loc.cit.* For a constructive approach to interaction between different curriculum disciplines, see Fachtna McCarthy's chapter, 'The Mind of God: Science and Theology Today', in *Faith and Culture in the Irish Context*, edited by Eoin Cassidy, Dublin, Veritas, 1996, especially pp.38-39, 42-46.

[70]In Appendix 1 I consider some of the difficulties that can arise for such teachers and for the schools which employ them, if the distinctiveness claimed for Catholic education is to be complemented by attitudes and practices which are sufficiently inclusive for staff, as well as for pupils.

[71]Leszek Kolakowski, *Religion*, (Glasgow, Fontana, 1982), p. 183. A few pages earlier Kolakowski had reminded us that "whatever people say in religious terms is understandable only by reference to the entire network of signs of the Sacred." p.178.

[72]Quoted by E. Kevane in *Philosophy and the Integration of Contemporary Catholic Education*, edited by G. McLean (The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, 1962), p.233. (The sentiment was echoed by Newman throughout his lectures on the Idea of a University.) Such interconnections require, however, a way of being integrated. The two necessary aspects of integration here are described by McLean as: "the unification of the many parts to form a complete and perfect whole, (and) the demand for the correlation of parts in terms of the most fundamental principles." *Ibid.* p.5.

[73]I acknowledge that Augustine and Aquinas differ in significant ways in their holisms. Thus Augustine *disconnects* body and person by comparison with Aquinas. And Aquinas insists on a *distinction* between philosophy and theology, between reason and revelation, in a way that is not characteristic of Augustine.

[74]J. Evans, (ed) *Jacques Maritain : The Man and His Achievement*, (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1963), pp.193-196.

[75]K. Nichols, (former National Adviser on Religious Education to the bishops of England and Wales) in *Priorities in Religious Education*, edited by Brenda Watson (London, The Falmer Press, 1992), p.115. where he says "elements which have a place in a unified system look different when they are extracted from it. Their meaning depends on their interconnections and on their place in the whole." Nichols quotes Newman: "The same doctrines, held in different religions, may be and often are held very differently, as belonging to distinct wholes or forms, as they are called, and exposed to the influence and the bias of the teaching, perhaps false, with which they are associated. Thus, for instance, whatever may be the resemblance between St Augustine's doctrine of Predestination and the tenet of Calvin upon it, the two really differ from each other toto coelo in significance and effect, in consequence of the place they hold in the systems in which they are respectively incorporated, just as shades and tints show so differently in a painting according to the masses of colour to which they are attached." from *A Grammar of Assent*, introduced by Nicholas Lash, London, University of Notre Dame Press,1979, pp.202-3.

[76]K. Nichols, in *Religion and Education : Islamic and Christian Approaches*, edited by Syed Ali Ashraf & Paul Hirst (The Islamic Academy, 1994), p.213.

[77]*Ibid.*, p.205.

[78]J.R. Martin, in *Beyond Liberal Education*, edited by Robin Barrow and Patricia White (London, Routledge, 1993), pp.116. She goes on (p.117.) to acknowledge that "the one kind of curricular completeness, connection and meaning does not ensure the other."

[79]See the essay by V.A. McClelland, 'The Concept of Catholic Education' in *The Catholic School and its European Context*, edited by him (Hull University, Aspects of Education, no. 46, 1992), p.6.

[80]For a comprehensive and concise summary of von Hügel's life and thought, see Kelly, James J, *Baron Friedrich von Hügel's Philosophy of Religion*, Leuven University Press, 1983. Alternative accounts are provided by Ellen Leonard, *Creative Tension : The Spiritual Legacy of Friedrich von Hügel*, Fordham University Press, 1997 and Joseph Whelan, *The Spirituality of Friedrich von Hügel*, London, Collins, 1971.

[81]Marvin O'Connell (in *Critics on Trial: An Introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis*, Washington, DC, Catholic University of America Press, 1994, pp.155-6) shows how much von Hügel had in common with the second major writer whose work I draw upon (see chapter six) in the development of this thesis, the French philosopher, Maurice Blondel. "Both were extremely devout laymen of independent means, both tireless workers in their chosen fields of research, both alert to contemporary developments in history and science, and both dedicated to bringing traditional Catholic thought into line with the insights provided by modern scholarship. Both were unabashed elitists, who found it hard to function effectively outside a small circle of intimates. They even shared a finicky concern for their physical health that sometimes bordered on hypochondria." (Both suffered from their nervous disposition and also from the handicap of deafness, in the case of von Hügel, and of -eventual - blindness, in the case of Blondel). In their writings both were to leave behind a major legacy which those who came after them could draw upon. Yet they both failed in their own lifetimes to convince the primary target groups whom they had set out to influence, in Blondel's case the secular university sector and in von Hugel's case, his fellow Catholics. Although for a short period of time, during the first decade of this century, in the context of the modernist crisis that shook the Catholic church, each stimulated the other to articulate his thought more precisely and clearly, and to this extent were indebted to one another, the major influence was undoubtedly Blondel, whose work had already made a big impression on von Hügel before he had published anything of significance. Both writers enjoyed a renaissance of wider interest as the shadows cast by modernist crisis were gradually dispersed, and with the shedding of prejudices left in its wake by those who sought either to justify or to condemn the outcome of the modernists' attempt to relate traditional thinking with new perspectives in Catholicism.

[82]On the condemnation of modernism, see chapter two, note 41.

[83]According to Bernard Holland, who introduced and edited von Hügel's *Selected Letters*, (London, Dent, 1927), p.13. Albert Cock refers to von Hügel's combination of "a broad sweep, a delicate penetration and an impressive humility" in *A Critical Examination of Von Hugel's Philosophy of Religion*, p.117. (No date is given, but

from internal evidence the study was clearly published in either 1948 or 1949. Instead of a publisher, only the distributors are mentioned: Hugh Rees, London.)

[84]Von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. 1, London, Dent, 1908, pp.59, 61, 70. According to von Hügel, each of the three elements is open to abuse, imbalance or distortion, but they are each capable of providing for one another a powerful and constant check and opposition within the complete spiritual life. See also Bernard Holland (ed), *Selected Letters* (of von Hügel)), London, Dent, 1927, p.191.

[85]von Hügel, *The Reality of God & Religion and Agnosticism*, edited by Edmund Gardner, London, Dent, 1931, pp.149-50; *Eternal Life*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1913, pp.350-1; *Selected Letters*, pp.39, 250.

[86]As one reference, among many, to von Hügel's sense of indebtedness to and esteem for Huvelin, see *Eternal Life*, pp.374-7.

[87]*Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. 2, pp.281, 283, 371, 393, 395.

[88]Von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, London, Dent, 1921, pp.238-9. On the need for attention to the various levels and needs of life, see von Hügel, *Essays and Addresses, Second Series*, London, Dent, 1926, pp.59-60.

[89]*Selected Letters*, p.349. "We never begin (or in the long run keep up) the apprehension of things spiritual except on occasion of the awakedness and stimulation of the senses...There is no such thing as an exclusively spiritual awakening to, or apprehension of spiritual Realities."

[90]*Ibid.*, p.260. See also p.289. :"have your life full of good, wholesome, not technically religious interests." These will be more and more "penetrated, warmed, widened, sweetened by the purest, humblest, most self-oblivious, homely heroism of supernature - of Grace. Such a life will greatly help you in keeping free from what might make you an unnecessary stumbling block to other not yet religiously awake souls."

[91]*Essays and Addresses*, p.238. *cf.* also *Essays and Addresses*: *Second Series*, pp.98, 107. and von Hügel, *Eternal Life*, p.329.

[92]*Essays and Addresses,*. p.230. cf p.283. where, in speaking of the body, von Hügel says, "even the loftiest sanctity finds here the substratum, the subject-matters, the occasions for its own supernatural life."

[93]*Essays and Addresses: Second Series*, pp.38, 229. cf *Letters from Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece* edited and introduced by Gwendolen Greene (London, Dent, 1928), pp.xxxii and 13.

[94]von Hügel (1931), *The Reality of God and Religion & Agnosticism*, pp.33, 36.

[95]*Eternal Life*, p.330.

[96]In von Hügel's experience developments in historical and biblical scholarship appeared more threatening to and more controversial for his church than those in the physical sciences. He spoke of the Galileo case as if it were an aberration from a more normal reticence on the part of Catholic theologians in interfering with scientific scholarship and theorising.

[97]*Ibid.*, p.332.

[98]*Ibid.*, pp.368,394.

[99]*Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. 1, pp.xxvi, 44.

[100]*Ibid.*, p.45. von Hügel continues, on p. 46. :"to starve or to suspect, to cramp or to crush this phenomenal apprehension and investigation, in the supposed interest of the ulterior truths, must ever be a besetting temptation and weakness for the religious instinct."

[101]*Ibid.*, p.47. *cf.* p.49. :"neither can the religious life suppress or do without the philosophical and the scientific, nor can either of these two other lives suppress or permanently do without its fellow or without religion."

[102]*Eternal Life*, p.357.

[103]Cock, Albert, *op.cit.*, p.77.

[104]McGrath, John *Baron Friedrich von Hügel and the Debate on Historical Christianity*, San Francisco, Mellen Research University Press, 1993, pp.157, 158. See pp.3 - 4: "Sin, the diversity of humanity, the slowness of healthy growth, the variety of drives and interests within the human body and spirit, the pressures an intense life - none of these is put aside as useless suffering. ...All are, for von Hügel, occasions for growth, deepening and self-transcendence."

[105]*Essays and Addresses*, p.xii.

[106]*Essays and Addresses: Second Series*, p.219.

[107]*Selected Letters*, p.94.

[108]*Ibid.*, p.72. Further on, (p.95.) von Hügel continues: "Only through this friction, admitted, recognised, fully and carefully retained, will our soul be able to rightly and richly move on and grow and become...Willed and loved friction wins fruit ever and everywhere."

[109]*Essays and Addresses: Second Series*, pp.62, 246-7. Also *Reality of God*, p.18.

[110]I owe my appreciation of von Hügel's subtle balancing of correction and confirmation in the development of our spiritual personalities to Albert Cock's comments (*op.cit.*, p.28.) on the constituents of religion being similar to 'the agenda, the credenda, and the corrigenda et confirmata of any world religion'. (I think confirmata should here read confirmanda.)

[111]"The essential, the most indispensable of the dimensions of religion is, *not breadth, but depth*, and above all, *the insight into sanctity and the power to produce saints*." Letter from von Hügel to Norman Kemp Smith, 3/1/1922. See *The Letters of Baron Friedrich von Hügel and Professor Norman Kemp Smith*, edited by Lawrence Barmann, New York, Fordham University Press, 1981, p.162. (emphasis in the original.)

[112]*Mystical Element*, vol. 1, p.369.

[113]Teilhard de Chardin, *Le Milieu Divin* (London, Collins, 1972) speaks of the passivities of diminishment, the place of asceticism , resignation and detachment.

Von Hügel would have greatly approved of this work of spirituality, eg, pp.88-9. "In God's hands the forces of diminishment have perceptibly become the tool that cuts, carves and polishes within us the stone which is destined to occupy a definite place in the heavenly Jerusalem....God must, in some way or other, make room for himself, hollowing us out and emptying us, if he is finally to penetrate into us. " Yet there is also the call to action, to take part in the struggle, not to be fearful, but bold and positive: "The Christian is not asked to swoon in the shadow, but to climb in the light, of the Cross." p.104. There is also in this work by Teilhard a reflection of von Hügel's emphasis on the value of all dimensions of life as vehicles on our heavenly journey: "By virtue of the Creation and, still more, of the Incarnation, nothing here below is profane for those who know how to see.."p.66.

[114]*Selected Letters*, p.275. Without combat, temptation and struggle, virtue could not develop within us. Heroic virtue, together with adoration, was the very essence of religion. "A religion is not worth much unless it produces heroic acts." (p.50.) "Courage, purity, compassion, humility, truthfulness, self-abandonment in the hands of God, spiritual joy - these are the seven great heroic virtues." (p.51.; also *Essays and Addresses*, p.284.) For the intellectual virtues, according to Von Hügel, see the list he provides in *The Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. 1, p.79. :"candour, moral courage, intellectual honesty, scrupulous accuracy, chivalrous fairness, endless docility to facts, disinterested collaboration, unconquerable hopefulness and perseverance, manly renunciation of popularity and easy honours, love of bracing labour and strengthening solitude." In the moral tone, depth and character of these intellectual virtues von Hügel reflects an older tradition, especially that of Newman, for example in *The Idea of a University* and *University Sermons*, one that seeks to relate intellectual progress much more closely to moral lifestyle than has been customary this century until the recent revival of Aristotelian emphases in moral and social philosophy. [For an exception to this separation of moral and intellectual qualities, see Nichols, Kevin, *Voice of the Hidden Waterfall*, Slough, St Paul Publications, 1980, pp.107-117. and also his chapter in *Religion and Education: Islamic and Christian Approaches*, edited by Syed Ali Ashraf and Paul Hirst, Cambridge, The Islamic Academy, 1994, pp.199-215.] I shall develop this theme further in chapter four.

[115]*Selected Letters*, p. 201.

[116]*Ibid.*, p.95.

[117]*Essays and Addresses*, p.230.

[118]*Essays and Addresses: Second Series*, pp.10, 12, 23. cf *Eternal Life*, p.324. In *Letters to a Niece* (pp.165-6) von Hügel refers to his efforts to make the church intellectually more inhabitable, since at this time he claimed it was less strong on the needs, rights and duties of the mental life than it was on promoting spiritual insights. Authority was one part, but a necessary one, within his Catholicism. "I believe because I am told," he said, but he then immediately went on to add, "because it is true, because it answers to my deepest interior experiences and needs." (*Mystical Element*, vol. 1, p.54.)

[119]*Essays and Addresses, Second Series,* p.17. Ibid. p.17. cf *Mystical Element,* vol. 1, p.62. where Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64) is cited as von Hügel's ideal embodiment of Catholicism, combining, in appropriate proportions, in the baron's estimation, a concern for the institutional, intellectual and the mystical elements of religious life.

[120]Albert Cock refers to von Hügel's "life-long practice of daily meditation, systematic prayer, frequent communion and confession." (*op.cit.*, p.129.)

[121]*Reality of God*, pp.13, 21. and *Letters to a Niece*, pp.xxxiv, 56.

[122]*Letters to a Niece*, p.x. *cf.* "I find myself inclined to be very zealous to help souls to make the most of what they already have; and, if they come to think of moving, to test them to the uttermost." *Selected Letters*, pp. 346-7.

[123]*Reality of God*, p.151. *Eternal Life*, p.352. He was convinced that "the persuasiveness of the church is in inverse ratio to her coercive character and action." p.352. cf. *Mystical Element*, vol. 1, p.xxvi.

[124]*Mystical Element*, vol. 1, p.34.

CHAPTER FOUR

Distinctive Worldview

If Catholic schools are to be distinctive, then much of this distinctiveness will rest upon their displaying an appreciation firstly, that the whole curriculum has a religious dimension, and, secondly, that all the disciplines, although autonomous, have a part to play in promoting the integral development of the whole person. One would need to add to such an appreciation a desire to integrate faith with both culture and life. This distinctiveness will also depend upon a shared world view and a shared concept of the sort of person that education should be aiming to develop, with Christ being taken as the prime role model.[1] No attempt to articulate a consistently thought through approach to education could avoid implying at least a view of the nature of persons and their place in the general order of things, including some ideas about what it is important for them to be like. As Philip May has pointed out, "behind every educational system, its aims, curricula, teaching methods and organization, lie assumptions about the nature of man and the purpose of life."[2] From a rather different perspective, Fred Inglis comments,"by implying a view of what to do with knowledge, the curriculum, like the culture, implies a picture of how to live and who to be."[3]

4.1 Shared view of life

Behind a Catholic philosophy of education there is an anthropology, a theology of creation, a Christology and an ecclesiology. I do not claim that the *content* of all these is distinctively Catholic. Many of the central elements within a Catholic worldview, for example, doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation and salvation, are shared by other

Christians.[4] The official Catholic position is that these shared doctrines are more fundamental for Christian faith than areas of doctrinal differences among Christians. Furthermore, many elements within a Christian worldview are also shared by people of other faiths.[5] As examples of these shared elements, apart from belief in God, I will refer in this chapter to the voice of conscience, the notion of the soul, the interconnectedness of intellectual, moral and spiritual qualities, the acknowledgement of sin, the need for a disciplining of our powers and a receptivity to grace.

With so much of importance held in common, both with fellow Christians and with people of other faiths, a powerful case could be made for ecumenical Christian schools and also for inter-faith education shared between, for example, Christians, Jews and Muslims. Despite being sympathetic to, indeed enthusiastic about, such projects, I intend to leave them on one side, for my aim here is to explore the internal coherence of the claim that (separate) Catholic education can combine distinctiveness with inclusiveness. Given my particular focus, I do not consider here why some other Christians, who share substantially a great many beliefs with Catholics, do not think separate schooling is either necessary or desirable. This interesting and important question would have to be addressed if one sought to provide a comprehensive exploration of the relationship between Christian philosophies of education and particular forms of schooling, or if one aimed for a critical and well-founded justification for separate, faith-based schooling. Both of these aims are beyond the scope of my narrower exploration here.

It is not essential to my argument that the elements within a Catholic Christian worldview that I pick out should lead inexorably to a desire for separate schooling even on the part of all Catholics. This would require a marked degree of uniformity

among Catholics in their understanding of and commitment to these elements and it would depend upon an approach by the church which was monolithic in its stance and pronouncements. There is no evidence of such uniformity among believers and much evidence of a high level of diversity within the church as a whole and within Catholic education in particular. This becomes clearer as soon as the context, composition and functioning of Catholic schools in other countries is examined.

There is, however, a central or 'mainstream' position within Catholicism which defends the right of the church to maintain schools under its aegis and guided by its own educational philosophy. While acknowledging the existence of alternative viewpoints on both the composition and weighting of the 'ingredients' of a Catholic worldview, and, following from this, that differences exist as to the need for, and indeed essential nature of, Catholic schools, for the purposes of this thesis I assume that the 'mainstream' position described here is representative and authoritative. The *salience* of the elements referred to in this chapter is so highly marked within Catholicism and their implications for education are so strongly emphasized, that a Catholic interpretation of them has *often in practice* been the foundation for a policy of separate schooling. It has frequently been assumed that Catholic education is to be provided to ensure that these elements receive due attention and appropriate treatment. Without the opportunity to provide such a religiously informed context for education, the Catholic Church believes that prevailing assumptions in society and education will undermine her teaching, hinder a sufficiently rounded development of persons and even distort in some way an understanding of those truths and values held in common with others.[6]

Within Catholic theology, ecclesiology, an understanding of church, plays a key role in the distinctive configuration and weighting of these elements. In ecumenical dialogue it is often different understandings of church which prevent agreement, rather than theological differences over personhood, creation or Christ. There is not scope here to analyze the multiple, complementary, mutually correcting and sometimes conflicting models of church which are available within Catholicism, for example, models of the church as institution, as herald, as Body of Christ, as sacrament, as servant or as mystical communion.[7] However, I would contend that her ecclesiology provides Catholicism with a particular way of bringing together thinking about human nature, the person of Christ and God as the source and goal of creation. It also establishes a context for understanding the relationship between the material and the spiritual, nature and grace, faith and reason, freedom and authority, discipline and development, and the individual and the community.[8] These polarities are important elements of a Catholic worldview. Any attempt to grasp the meaning, scope and significance of Catholic doctrine, morality and spirituality is likely to be deficient if these are not interpreted in the context of a Catholic ecclesiology. The overall shape of Catholic education, likewise, can only be appreciated if it is related to a Catholic understanding of the church and its mission. In the light of my claim about the importance of ecclesiology, it should not be surprising if I seek to resolve some of the problems arising from an ambivalence within Catholic education - the twin imperatives to be both distinctive and inclusive - by retrieving in a later chapter a deeper sense of church, specifically through drawing upon the notion of living tradition.[9]

It is because the Catholic picture of human life, its nature, purpose and destiny, differs in crucial respects from some other accounts which are predominant in society, that

many Catholics seek a separate context for the education of their children, one which allows that different world to be envisaged and that different person to develop. From the perspective of a Catholic approach to education, alternative worldviews are deficient in one or other respect in their 'reading' of human nature and destiny: perhaps through omission, imbalance, exaggeration or under-emphasis. This position does not directly contradict but it co-exists in some tension with the Catholic position that there is much truth and value in worldviews outside the church, that the church herself is damaged by sin and should always be open to reform, that the church should always be ready, not only to communicate her message but at the same time ready to learn from others in order to augment and penetrate more deeply into what she already possesses.

Any presentation of a set of beliefs is bound to be influenced by the prevailing assumptions of the people being addressed; that is, it will not be 'free-standing' in the sense that it is irrelevant who the debating partners are. What they are for and what they neglect will both frame and modify the presentation, what is emphasized and omitted, the 'shape' or ordering of the presentation and the implications drawn from it. I think it is a fair assumption (although not one I have room to justify here) that *recent* arguments for the continuation of an educational policy of separate Catholic schooling within England and Wales have been conducted with the perceived shortcomings of liberal, secular and market-led ideologies principally in mind, rather than any perceived shortcomings of other Christian or religious groups. In the light of this my focus on conscience, soul, the interconnectedness of intellectual, moral and spiritual qualities, sin, discipline and grace as key aspects of a Catholic worldview which provide a foundation for those key elements of Catholic education which were outlined in chapter three, may appear less strange. They will *not* add up to an

adequate summary of Catholic beliefs; they will *not* distinguish clearly Catholicism from other parts of the Christian church; but they should *reveal important features of the worldview* which underpins the key concepts analyzed in the previous chapter and in casting light on the *distinctiveness* of the worldview Catholic education, some of its parameters and requirements, they should *signal the problematical relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness.*

In order to bring into focus some of these key aspects of a Catholic worldview which underpin a Catholic philosophy of education, I take the following steps. First, I draw upon the thought of Newman in emphasizing the importance of conscience and the moral dimension of the search for truth. Second, I consider the central role of religion in education. Third, I identify elements which contribute to the integral development of persons. Fourth, I explore some of the connections between an understanding of human persons, the personhood of Christ and the formation of character. Fifth, I comment on some of Maritain's work in seeking to achieve a deeper understanding of personhood by relating this concept both to individuality and to our relations with others. Sixth, I draw out some of the implications of the belief that we are made in God's image. Seventh, I distinguish several aspects and implications of the belief that all people have a vocation from God.

4.2 Newman and Christian Education

Newman, writing in the nineteenth century, interpreted some of the intellectual assumptions of his time as implicitly undermining of a Christian understanding of the relationship between religion and education and between faith and reason. He anticipated the threat to religious believers caused by the tendency within liberal

education towards both reductionism and an apparent neutrality which in reality marginalized religious considerations and priorities.[10]

In *The Idea of a University* Newman argued forcibly, not only for comprehensiveness in the range of disciplines available for study in a university and for the preservation of a sense of the unity of knowledge, but also for the essential presence of theological study within that unity. Theology is required, not only as a subject which offers worthwhile academic knowledge in its own right, but also as a necessary condition for the development among students of a holistic understanding of the interrelationships between character formation and the acquisition of knowledge.[11] Newman analyses (among other topics) the mutual bearing on each other of theology and other knowledge and the corresponding duties (regarding intellectual development and spiritual growth) owed to one another by the church and the academy.[12] One might fairly paraphrase Newman's view of the role of theology and religion within the circle of knowledge as one which was simultaneously academic, edificatory (or existentialist) and architectonic. Although Newman wished to preserve the freedom of the investigator (we all need 'elbow room' in the domain of thought) he stressed the real possibility of the abuse of our intellectual gifts if they are not disciplined by appropriate habits, lifestyle and formation.[13]

For Newman, one of the ways that secular and liberal approaches to education fail to do justice to a Catholic view of human nature and needs is their neglect of the voice of conscience in prompting us to look out for revelation.[14] He strongly emphasized the role of religious knowledge in building up the personality and also paradoxically the development that was necessary, before religious knowledge could be attained. He particularly dwelt on the working of conscience which, he claimed, makes humans

aware of the presence in their lives of a divine Judge. His view was that there is something *in* us which is not merely *of* us, which points us beyond ourselves, if we can only discern its operations sufficiently clearly.

> It is more than man's own self. The man has no power over it, or only with extreme difficulty; he did not make it; he cannot destroy it;...he can disobey it, he may refuse it, but it remains.[15]

Not only does the conscience, according to Newman, represent for us the divine voice, but the more we follow its dictates and heed its warnings, so much the more clearly will we hear its tones, understand its message, love its commands and be more consciously present to the speaker.[16]

If for some religious educators the apprehension of truth necessarily precedes the adoption of a religious life-style and the practice of a particular morality, the reverse is true, at least in the order of life, if not in the order of logic, for Newman: the attainment of truth in the religious sphere is the fruit rather than the root of virtue. Moral life makes possible the recognition of religious truth. The stress in recent years on religious enquiry as 'the long search', valuable though it has been in its implications for inter-religious dialogue and ecumenism, for the development of a historical perspective and for encouraging greater openness to and respect for the views of other people, needs to be balanced by the reminder that the journey is also a moral one; it is not an intellectual game. As Newman says: "no enquiry comes to good which is not conducted under a deep sense of responsibility, and of the issues depending on its determination."[17]

The search for religious truth which has been tested for its reliability will be dependent in part at least for its success upon the moral state of the searcher. The search will

sometimes be painful, because it will necessarily involve scrutiny of the self, not merely the observation of other religious persons. According to such a view, the search will entail interrogation of our own consciences; access to truth is only made possible through moral living and a right state of heart.[18] While we live under the sovereignty of sin our minds are clouded and our discernment of truth cannot be clear, confident or consistent. It is only in the wake of a faithful existence, after a conversion that is simultaneously intellectual, moral and spiritual, and which frees us from the noetic implications of sin, that we attain to objectivity in knowledge in the moral, spiritual and religious order.[19]

The prior commitment to a substantial understanding of the good implied by Newman and his requirement that Christian education embrace character formation, the nurturing of conscience and the habits of religious disciplines alongside of intellectual enquiry, clearly present problems for educators in a pluralist society where schools do not have a mandate to conduct themselves along these lines.[20] Far from religious beliefs shaping the educational process, as Newman would have wished, they have frequently been marginalised both in society generally and in schools in particular.

4.3 Religion in education: marginal or central?

Two examples of such argument are those provided by Stephen Carter and George Marsden respectively.[21] Carter's thesis is that in the public square (in the USA), religion meets not with hostility, but rather with trivialization, being treated "as an unimportant facet of human personality."[22] As a result, the free exercise of religion is inhibited and too many constraints are put in its way in order to prevent the baleful effects of either religious exclusivity or excessive influence.[23]

In the context of higher education (again in the USA) Marsden laments the marginalization of religious belief and practice and accuses the academy in general of privileging 'methodological atheism' and cultural relativism.[24] Marsden shows how religious faith can have an important bearing on scholarship and, by implication, suggests that to suppress awareness of such potential bearing leads to a diminution of the quality of scholarship at work.[25] He argues that religious beliefs "shape not only our overt ways of valuing things, but also our priorities". [26] They affect what we select as worthy of study, the questions we ask and the theories which appear to possess explanatory power. Religious beliefs, according to Marsden, will affect our motivation for study, the application of our research, how we interpret its wider implications and how we relate these to our overall picture of the world.[27] As examples of (Christian) religious doctrines which have a bearing on scholarship, he cites those relating to creation and to the incarnation. He argues that the first has implications for how we think about human rights, moral principles and even epistemology, and that the second has implications for our understanding of the possible relationships between the supernatural and the natural realms and how the contingent can be a vehicle of access to the transcendent.[28]

Whether or not the various charges levelled by Carter and Marsden against the prevailing social and academic culture of their society are fully justified, and whether or not it is reasonable to expect that their diagnosis has at least a degree of transferability to the UK context, I am assuming for the sake of my argument that some religious believers in this country *perceive* the social and educational arrangements of our society as being inhospitable to the nurturing of religious faith and lifestyle.[29] The desire of the Catholic community for a distinctive form of

education rests on a substantial, comprehensive and integrated view of the human person and a particular worldview which are contested in our society and held by only a minority of the population. To the extent that the charges levelled by Carter and Marsden are warranted, the desire for a distinctive form of education cannot be satisfied without the provision of separate schooling to ensure that the Catholic view of personhood is adequately attended to and that it is appropriately promoted throughout the curriculum and school community.

My argument thus far does not, of course, entail state support for such separate provision. Additional arguments are needed if state support is to be indicated. In chapter seven I consider several of the charges levelled against separate Catholic schooling and I supply a seven strand argument in defence of the claim that Catholic schools contribute to the common good and therefore, by implication, the claim that they deserve support from the public purse, so long as certain social safeguards are in place and provided that certain educational conditions are met. In this chapter I focus on those aspects of personhood which are essential to a Catholic worldview and which are foundational for Catholic education.

4.4 Integral Development

There are many aspects to understanding human beings which have, over the centuries, surfaced as significant: that they are embodied, that they have the use of reason, can laugh, imagine what is not there in front of them, can communicate and create, and that they have free will.[30] Of these human characteristics, the capacities for the use of reason and the exercise of free will have traditionally been seen as absolutely crucial in identifying what distinguishes humanity from the rest of creation.

Reason and free will make it possible for human beings to transcend mere 'givenness' in their lives, where they are simply being acted upon. These qualities enable persons to display a degree of intelligent agency where they contribute something original, in the sense that it is not automatically programmed into them or laid down in advance as part of their nature. Both rationality and freedom of the will have been held to reflect features of divinity.[31]

Alternative emphases have stressed that human beings are sinful, flawed, finite and self-defeating creatures, in need of redemption, conversion, transformation and salvation. A humble recognition of the harsh reality of this weaker side of human nature, with its proneness to negativity, cowardice, contradiction, confusion, isolation, social violence and self-destruction prevents too optimistic a view of human nature from being held and it suggests the need for salvation from a source beyond humanity. The power of sin has a bearing on internal obstacles to learning, in that "deceit, the violation of intellectual honesty, the resistance to reality, and the fear of truth are all very much with us." [32] It is through recognition, not only of human limitations and fallibility, but also of the 'dark' side of ourselves, the capacity, not only to miss the best but to pursue the worst and to fall into evil ways, that Christian moral principles have a significantly different configuration from much contemporary secular morality, even on those occasions when what is enjoined or forbidden appears similar in content within their respective codes of conduct.[33]

Stanley Hauerwas points out that "the language of spiritual growth, holiness and perfection directs attention to the development of the moral self in a manner quite different from the contemporary concern with moral development."[34] He picks out several features of Christian morality which distinguish it in important ways from its

secular counterparts. These include several notions: life is to be treated as a gift; we are called to imitate a master; this entails accepting that we need to be rescued from ourselves; this requires conversion, followed by obedience and faithfulness. Christians also describe the self as subject to sin, a theological term which does not simply mean that we are capable of wrongdoing but that we are estranged from God who is the source and goal of our being.[35] It will immediately be clear that this is very different from an emphasis on autonomy, development of our powers and rational decision making.[36]

In one of the rare textbooks outlining a Catholic philosophy of education, written forty years ago, Redden and Ryan claim that Catholic education takes into account the 'whole man', because it embraces the "development and discipline of all the powers of body and soul, and essentially is, therefore, religious, moral, liberal, cultural, and universal."[37] Two things should be noted here. First, the use of the word 'discipline' with regard to our powers is significant; they are not simply to expand in a way that is a natural unfolding; they will have to face some degree of curbing, of constraint; our energies have to be harnessed and transformed under a set of norms.[38] Secondly, the 'soul' - also to be developed and disciplined - is a concept which is mysterious, even alien in a secular society, where lack of consensus about religious matters has meant that neutrality or silence on 'the soul' must be the order of the day.

Yet omission of a sense of the soul, from a Catholic perspective, distorts entirely our understanding of persons, their development and their destiny. As Redden and Ryan say, "it makes a great difference in the theory and practice of education whether or not one admits the existence of the soul...the freedom of the will, and the doctrine of original sin."[39] For tied up with an understanding of what might be meant by soul,

other concepts come into view, for example, unrepeatability and incommunicability.[40] If education is based on a false picture of human nature and of its final end, such education will inevitably be seriously deficient. It will not take proper account of either our weaknesses and needs or of our strengths and potentialities. In 1929 Pope Pius XI challenged contemporary educational theories thus: "every method of education founded, wholly or in part, on the denial or forgetfulness of Original Sin and of grace, and relying on the sole powers of human nature, is unsound."[41]

There are several elements hinted at in that quotation. They could perhaps be put as follows. There is the longer-term perspective offered from within religious faith: it is not sufficient to prepare people for life on earth; this is not our final resting place, our ultimate destination. This-worldly concerns are, of course, very important; but, of themselves, they are not enough; indeed, they can be misinterpreted if not read *sub specie aeternitatis*.[42] Original sin is a reality which must be taken into account; human beings are flawed; the nature, cause, effects of and remedy for human defects must be acknowledged. This will necessarily involve opening humanity up to resources which come from beyond its own powers, however much these have been developed. These powers, good in themselves, are condemned to distortion, sterility or misuse through the effects of sin. Because of the prevalence of sin in human beings, the intellect is less able to attain truth, the will less able to seek for the good and human nature is more inclined towards evil.[43] From a Christian perspective, all the help we need is freely available from God if we are ready to receive it. The work of education entails preparing in us an active receptivity.

If I have extrapolated more than is contained in the letter of that quotation from Pius XI, I do not think that I have strayed from the spirit contained within it. What is clear

is that a Catholic philosophy of education rests upon a particular view of the human person and of the purpose of life, a view that embraces a dialectic of development and discipline, one which leads, not only to full humanity, but also to divinisation. In this chapter some key aspects of the Catholic understanding of the person are explored further, since an understanding of these is integral to the case for a distinctive approach to education.

4.5 Identity and Character

An understanding of the human person is of such importance for Christians that one might justifiably claim it is a focal point in their theology. What is the meaning and significance of this claim? I offer five considerations. First, a reflection on the nature, meaning and destiny of human persons is at the centre of much theological writing. Second, I expect, by concentrating on the notion of person, to find an entry into what is at the very heart of theological concerns: the difference God makes to our lives, to the way we see them and to the way we live them. Third, although Christians do not believe that God is only concerned about the place of humanity in the cosmos, they do hold that in some mysterious way the secret of God's purposes and, indeed God's very nature, is implicated in and revealed through the emergence of humanity. Fourth, a better understanding of our own being - and its possibilities for becoming - will prompt us towards a more adequate appreciation of the world in which we find ourselves and our relationship with the beings and Being which surround us. Finally, Christians believe that there is a special connection between the person of Jesus the Christ and the personhood of humans.

There are many scriptural references to the role of Christ in changing us so radically that we put on a new nature.[44] Certainly for Christians the answer to the question "who do you say that I am?" put by Jesus to his disciples[45] relates intimately to the answer we might each give to the question "who am I?" For Christ's understanding of himself and his mission has decisively influenced the way many human beings have come to understand themselves. This influence is brought out by theologian Michael Himes in the following way. Himes suggests that the Church's reflection on the significance of what God was doing in Jesus the Christ and the belief that in him there was revealed 'true God *and* true man' - where the '*and*' might with justification be rendered 'in the light of' or 'because of' - is an attempt to bring out the conviction that "the fuller the expression of God, the richer the humanity which receives the impression, *and* the more fully and richly human one is, then the more perfectly one receives God who is always self-gift."[46] In other words, Christ shows us that divinity and humanity are not in competition; indeed the more fully human we become, the more aptly we express divinity (although I stress in this chapter that this does not imply a belief in a natural 'unfolding' or 'expansion' of our nature).[47]

The connection between our understanding of the person of Christ and of human personhood more generally has two related aspects. The first aspect stems from the conviction that Jesus came to show us the true nature and potential of humanity (not only to *reveal* what we can be, but also to enable us to *realize* that potential). Belief in the Incarnation leads to a new picture of humanity, one which is open to the divinizing grace of Christ and union with God. This entails a re-ordering, indeed a transformation of our lives, our powers and aspirations. The second aspect of the connection stems from the belief that the more understanding we have of the nature, purpose and work of Jesus the Christ, the more light will be cast on our lives. As a

coda we might add that the more we can enter with insight into the depths of our lives and their manifold dimensions, the better we shall come to appreciate what was going on and what was revealed for our salvation in the life of Jesus.[48]

In short, a study of the human person is central to the concerns of Christian theology. It allows us to see how God's grace and call affect all that we are and do. Christians believe that they have a distinctive perspective on human nature. If we ignore or work against this understanding of human personhood, they would claim, we are likely to defeat our own projects, to damage creation and to diminish all life, including our own. On the other hand, if we allow ourselves to grapple with, to be illuminated by and to be nourished within a Christian appreciation of and perspective on personhood, life will be, not merely enhanced, but exalted.

A Christian perspective on personhood may differ in crucial respects from alternative views, but this does not rule out aspects of continuity and of common ground : Christian teaching is not that grace works to suppress or to destroy nature, but rather that it embraces, enlivens, reorders and reintegrates and, in so doing, elevates it.[49] I have already mentioned (as part of my comments on Newman) concern for the formation of character as an integral part of education. The idea that character is central to an understanding of personhood and so also of education would be shared by people of many different faiths and worldviews. Even a brief analysis of character reveals both similarities and differences of emphasis between Christians and others. The notion deserves more exploration than I can devote to it here.[50] At this point I merely pick out four of its aspects which, when taken together, have a bearing on the main line of argument being pursued in this chapter.

Joseph Dunne describes the self in three ways.[51] First, there is the 'sovereign' self, where we have a stable centre and a secure anchorage. Second, in reaction against this way of speaking, there is the 'deconstructed' self. Under the influence of, for example, Marx and Freud, and taking into account the effects of alienation, the subconscious and false consciousness stemming from the various types of oppression and repression in life, the deconstructed self loses its security. The third self is the 'storied' or the 'historical' self, where "we make sense - or fail to make sense - of our lives by the kind of story we can - or cannot - tell about it."[52] This third self, with the notions of narrative and accountability which are central to it, is important for the particular understanding of character which I am reaching towards, for it brings out the need to make sense of life as a whole, that is, to see the "whole picture," and not merely settle for understanding life as a series of isolated episodes.[53] Without suppressing the questioning and critique required by the deconstructed self, a Christian educator might wish to develop further and to give special emphasis to several features suggested (but not spelt out) by Dunne's analysis: each person's own intimate 'anchorage' in God, the sacredness of the selfhood of every other person, human participation in an ongoing narrative of both individual and community-based receptivity and responsiveness to God's communication, and to the notion of our stewardship of the gift of creation.

The second contribution towards a better understanding of character I take from Nicholas Dent, who reminds us that the kinds of ends we aim for in life will make all the difference to the kinds of virtues and vices we develop. He turns our attention away from the powers at our disposal and directs it instead towards our goals.[54] Again, a Christian educator might develop this further by advocating a transcendent rather than a subjective humanism as a developmental goal.[55] Education should

focus our attention on the worthiness and coherence of our goals, the nature of their authority and the kind of discipline they impose on us if we are to attain them. More than self-realization is required for healthy growth of character.[56]

Picking up this point about character being related to the ends we pursue and the attachments towards which we feel drawn, Michael Sandel provides the third clarification when he points out that, not only can such aims and attachments be transformed, so that the very person that I am is called into question, but we can come to be possessed by those things - including those qualities - we think we own. "As my attachment to [something] grows, it gradually becomes attached to me...[and] constitutive of my identity; it becomes more and more *me*, and less and less *mine*...the less I possess it, and the more I am possessed by it."[57] In order to prevent our being over-controlled by those things we are attached to, the Christian educator might wish to stress here the role of self-examination and self-denial as integral elements in any form of education which claimed to liberate students from whatever might threaten or diminish their humanity.

Fourthly, Craig Dykstra puts the development of character in the context of the worshipping community. Only in such a context can a Christian form an adequate understanding of the moral growth and education of persons. Without the presence of "worship and prayer, confession and repentance, biblical and theological study and interpretation, fellowship and discipleship," we will operate with inadequate concepts, we shall miss key elements in our stories, we shall fail to strive for the right ends and we shall not be appropriately transformed.[58] A Christian does not find out who he or she really is by introspection or in isolation from the practising faith community. Here

the Christian educator stresses the value of an ecclesial context for character formation and self-knowledge.

Of course, knowing who I am cannot be separated either from finding out whence I have come , (my origins and history), or whither I am going (my future development and destiny). *I find that my identity is partly given and partly still a task to be carried* out. It is already there to be discovered and yet also still to be constructed. One of the paradoxes of personhood is that, even when I accept, through faith, that God is constantly present to me, offering support and constant love, nevertheless I still experience my identity as both guaranteed and yet fragile. An exploration of who I am opens up certain polarities within me. Along with continuity and sameness I recognize change within me, whether I resist or welcome it. With the stability and shaping brought about externally by context, culture and constraint, and internally by habit, decisions and inertia, I also find within myself an openness, a lack of imprisonment by the past, a readiness to go beyond current parameters and expectations, my own and those of others.[59] Despite limitations, constraints and past commitments, there is still an element of freedom available to me.[60] In the midst of much familiarity the strange and the striking can prompt me to wonder and to question, perhaps even to change direction, or at least to see things differently.[61]

This very element of freedom is double-edged. It can be used positively. I can also use it to resist the good and to run the risk of falling into sin.[62] If some causes of falling into wrongdoing, for example, "ignorance, inadvertence, duress, fear, habit, inordinate attachments,"[63] may appear to offer me some excuses or to reduce part of my responsibility, nevertheless, even some of these may develop a hold on me due to culpable neglect, neglect either of appropriate sources of help and guidance, or neglect

of good habits and sound attachments. My freedom then constitutes a mixed blessing for me, since it leaves room for errors in both lifestyle and in particular moral judgements.[64] It leaves open the possibility that conflicting or inappropriate allegiances will gain a foothold in my life. The Christian educator may at this point wish to stress our need for forgiveness, for conversion and for receptivity to the redemptive work of Christ.

4.6 Individuality, Personhood & Otherness

In my brief analysis of character several implications for Christian education have emerged. I indicated that human development involves much more than a mere natural unfolding of the tendencies latent within me. Questions about the possibility of God as transcendent source and goal of human existence have been put on the educational agenda. I warned against both an over-emphasis on, and an unwarranted optimism about, the individual. I expressed caution about any notion of human self-sufficiency and highlighted the fragility of freedom. Taken together, these reflections are indicative of some aspects of the tension that exists between a Christian understanding of personhood and the language of much contemporary education.[65]

This tension can be clarified further by considering the difference between individuality and personality. In recent years, across a wide range of writing, including philosophy, political theory, sociology, ecology and economics, there has been a growing challenge to what is felt to be an over-emphasis on individualism and its attendant narrowness, competition, exploitation and destructiveness.[66] A return to a more relational understanding of the person, informed by a Christian perspective, might assist us in seeing how an imbalanced picture of individuality has contributed to

the expression of selfishness, ingratitude, despair, isolation, mistrust, fear, apathy and possessiveness often castigated by advocates of a more communitarian approach. Too often, as Colin Gunton remarks, "such features of our humanity that have sometimes been taken to represent the sole or chief quality of personhood, such as consciousness, subjectivity, conscience, will, reason, creativity are all capable of -- indeed, positively encourage -- individualistic and non-relational views of the person in society and the world."[67] These are constituent and essential features of humanity. They need to be placed in a context where the notions of spirit, otherness and relationship are taken seriously if they are not to distort our reading of personhood.

Jacques Maritain, writing during the Second World War, identified the error behind much of this misreading of human nature, the confusion between individuality and personality. For Maritain the foundation for individuality is matter, whereas the foundation for personality is spirit.[68] Given the psychological associations which have gathered around the word 'personality' and its connotations of inner drives, subconscious motivations and superficial idiosyncrasies, we might now prefer to employ instead the word 'personhood', a term which conveys more *gravitas*. 'Personhood,' rather than 'personality,' also suggests something we have exercised more control over, both in terms of moral decision-making and in terms of the degree of rationality displayed. Both individuality and personhood are key aspects of our total being and what they each rest upon, matter and spirit respectively, are vital elements in the composite being that we are.

In distinguishing these aspects Maritain says that personality - or, as I prefer, personhood - is about the "mastery and independence of my spiritual self", whereas individuality is about "the letting loose of the tendencies which are present in me by

virtue of matter and heredity."[69] We might distinguish these two poles of our being in the following way. Individuality is what will "unfold" naturally and inexorably from us, given the initial material deposit which we inherit and subject to the usual battery of natural forces and external influences and pressures which human beings encounter and which impinge upon their development. Personhood will only emerge through a deliberate and conscious engagement of our will and reason in decisions and a moral life which transcend our origins in the sense that they are not totally governed by our natural inheritance.[70] When Maritain speaks of personality, he refers to something interior to us. "This internal selfhood grows in proportion as the life of reason and freedom dominate over the life of instinct and sensual desire."[71] On the other hand, to speak of individuality is to refer to the material ego. "The ego is in reality scattered among cheap desires or overwhelming passions, and finally submitted to the determination of matter."[72]

Maritain's intention was not the downgrading of individuality but its inclusion, deployment and enhancement in the development of personhood. Individuality for him is heavily associated with the different but related notion of individualism. A focus on either individuality or individualism could tempt us into isolation and a more diminished life. Maritain had also seen that an overemphasis on individuality opened the way to the apparently opposite danger of collectivism. Only a life tempered by discipline, sacrifice, self-control and spirituality could stand against the crowd, whether in Nazi Germany or in Communist Russia.

If excessive emphasis on self-reliance and a reduced sense of community are side-effects of an imbalanced stress on the importance of the individual, as opposed to the person, Christianity has not escaped accusations of an exclusive preoccupation with

individual salvation, as if this was a one-to-one transaction between the individual and God. Recent reflection on education in the English Catholic Church has reiterated the social nature of human beings and stressed the essential solidarity required of Christians.[73] It could be argued, from a faith perspective, and on a wider plane than education, not only that we owe each other mutual support and consideration, but that we need each other, with our mutual differences and our stimulation, our chafing and challenges to one another, to learn who we are and how we can become what we would like to be. We also need each other to get to heaven - and not simply as occasions of earning grace.

The importance of solidarity has sometimes been neglected in previous articulations of the meaning of the image of God in humanity. If we concentrate too much on an individualistic interpretation of this image of God in us, we might surrender to the cult of self-sufficiency advocated in our society. In doing so we might then slip into falsely valuing people according to their achievements. We might fail to recognize that "people's worth does not come from their ability, beauty, or goodness."[74] In the context of Catholic education, pupils are not to be judged as more or less worthy of attention, according to their capacity for contributing to the economy or according to their academic ability.[75] The twin beliefs, that every human person, being made in the image of God, possesses an ineradicable dignity, and that in relieving our neighbour's suffering we are serving Christ, are central to Christian teaching. These beliefs have major implications for school policies, for example, those relating to pupil admissions, discipline, resource allocation, community service, personal and social education, support for those with special needs, the evaluation and celebration of pupils' work, pastoral care and teacher appraisal.

One way of showing respect for the dignity of pupils and a concern for their flourishing is the establishing by the teacher of an appropriate distance. By this I mean three things. First, an acknowledgement of the uniqueness of each person and his or her special gifts. This will entail providing opportunities for the exercise of choice, responsibility, initiative and decision-making. Such psychological 'space' for each pupil is an aspect of the distance to which I am referring.

Second, in the process of teaching, pupils should be encouraged to avoid the temptation to 'domesticate' too quickly what appears strange to them. The assimilation into their own categories of describing and evaluating should be balanced by an openness to what is 'other' than them, in terms of people, problems and situations. Admitting what is alien, uncomfortable and demanding into our lives is important for our spiritual growth. This second aspect of distance refers to the space between pupils and the subject matter they engage with.

Third, the maintenance of a certain distance between teachers and their pupils ensures that teachers avoid two types of excess in their classrooms. The first of these is the danger of domination over pupils, which prevents their empowerment. The second is the contrary risk of subordinating the role of the teacher to meeting pupils' current wants and interests. On the one hand, manipulation and coercion rob pupils of freedom. On the other hand, if the teacher yields too readily to pupils' current immaturity and fails to challenge them with what appears at first as 'foreign' or 'other', this will prevent their growth. "Preserving the child's freedom, as well as the teacher's, means integrating otherness as a necessary condition of the educational relation."[76]

My comments on the implications for education of a Christian understanding of human beings suggest that freedom is related more to personhood than to individuality. Christian freedom should not be confused with the individualism and self-expression which are encouraged in our contemporary culture. In such a context freedom means removal of constraints and self-sufficiency. Seen this way, freedom might seem to be threatened by any (or all) of the following : tradition, community, authority, the discipline of accepting objective morality, the possibility of permanent commitment, the notion of divine revelation, all of which are integral to Catholic Christianity.

Christian freedom, in contrast, takes seriously our social nature, our interdependence and our duty to preserve the common good; it expects our decisions to be taken in the light of an informed conscience and guided by a truth which comes from beyond ourselves. A Christian interprets freedom as best developed in a theonomous and Christocentric way, and as oriented to salvation, rather than autonomously, believing that humans flourish best only by accepting God's authoritative guidance and grace and by following the path of discipleship laid down by Jesus the Christ and witnessed to in the New Testament.[77] This kind of freedom, far from inducing passivity, narrowness or exclusiveness on the part of learners, requires from them an active receptivity, an openness to the unfamiliar, an energetic engagement with the world and an inclusive reaching out to others.[78]

In some respects my attempt to expose the problematical nature of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness within Catholic education, and to suggest that a better understanding of this relationship can be found from within the resources of Catholic tradition, echoes on a smaller scale and in a narrower context some of the

work of Richard Pring, who, in the broader context of an analysis of potentially competing educational concepts, and while developing a rather different trajectory of ideas and argumentation, offers a catholic treatment of the whole person which is in close harmony with a more explicitly Catholic understanding of persons. He depicts the whole person as one who combines knowledge and understanding, intellectual virtues, imagination, intellectual skills, self-reflection, moral virtues and habits, social and political involvement, integrity and authenticity.[79] He criticises liberal education for being insufficiently inclusive, for example, of the world of work, the political dimension, personal relationships and for excluding the less academic. He also criticises the vocational tradition in education for being too narrow in its concerns (and thereby excluding too much).[80] In exposing and challenging false dichotomies between the academic and the vocational, between theory and practice and between education and training,[81] his critique aims to retrieve the best features of both ends of each of these polarities and to achieve an integration of the worlds of learning, of work and of everyday life. In the same way I hope to bring out the false dichotomy of an inadequate understanding of distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education and to show that these features can, to a significant degree, be reconciled.

4.7 God's Image

Christians commonly say of human beings that they are precious because they are made in the image of God. This is not meant to separate them from, or to downgrade, the rest of creation. If we are made in the image of God, this does not mean that we do not need the world and other creatures to become truly ourselves. God does not invite us to bypass creation, but to plumb its depths and to journey through it. Nor does it mean that we have nothing to give to it. Indeed, as moral

theologian Kevin Kelly points out, not only are we dependent upon the rest of the material world, but also, increasingly, "the rest of the material world is becoming dependent on us for its survival."[82]

When unpacked, we find that believing we are made in the image of God entails a further belief. According to this, we have a task to carry out on behalf of the rest of creation, as its priests, mediators, or bridge-builders; we are to name it, that is, to recognize its particularity, to bless it, to work in harmony with it and to bring it to God. This does not imply a simple acceptance of the world as it is, any more than it means merely an acceptance of the way we are. Not only is personal conversion required, following criticism and judgement of those elements within us which need to be confronted. We are also called upon to confront unjust social situations, to remedy the damaging side-effects of some natural processes and to alleviate suffering wherever it occurs, whether this stems from nature, from divisive and destructive social structures and institutions, or whether it is self-inflicted.

These implications of the Christian belief that human beings are made in the image of God are relevant to Catholic education in that they indicate how the promotion of critical rationality, scientific knowledge and technological skill through the curriculum should be underpinned by moral values and a concern for ecological harmony, environmental health, reduction of unnecessary suffering and the promotion of social justice. The stimulus of intellectual enquiry and the development of academic knowledge, valuable though these are in themselves, should also be directed towards the service of others, concerned for flourishing of all God's creatures, guided by the path of discipleship and aimed at a personal relationship with Christ.

4.8 *Vocation*

In emphasising the importance of a personal relationship with Christ, we need to stress that this does not entail the surrender of a subject to an overlord, although this is indeed how such a relationship has often been described in the past in more hierarchical societies. A relationship with Christ leads not to the subordination of the real and particular 'me' but rather to its strengthening, enhancement and elevation. As put by Alistair McFadyen, "God relates with what is other in a way which guarantees its independence, but which calls it into free relation with God; calls it to join in the fullness of divine life in a manner appropriate to its own existence."[83] True union does not dissolve but differentiates. This is seen in the work of the Spirit at Pentecost, which led to the apostles speaking, not in one (either heavenly or earthly) language, but in the various other languages of the people around them at that time. Just as those who heard Peter and friends then were amazed to be spoken to in their native languages, so we too will find that we are spoken to in all the specific conditions and particular situations of our lives.

Of course, the various parts of our nature can serve both as obstacles to, as well as building blocks for, a fully rounded relationship with God through the person of Christ. We are called, with the help of God's grace working in our soul, to mediate a spiritual vocation to the body and, on the broader canvas of life, to mediate a divine vocation to the world as a whole.[84] This double-sided calling or vocation, which it is our task to carry out, comes to us in two ways: firstly, externally, as it were, mediated by the living tradition of the Church; secondly it emerges internally, from within us and from our encounter with the world. In our response to these forms of God's communication there follows a third type of calling, which comes through us, and is

directed towards creation. We are familiar with the first; it focuses particularly on the preaching of the Gospel, sacramental celebration and the reception of the Church's teaching and life. We are less familiar with the second source, not so much in the *experiencing of it but in the recognition of it as coming from God. It is often* experienced as a lack, a hunger or a desire, a never-ending drive or search or restlessness, a permanent dissatisfaction with the things of this world. This absence of, yet unquenched desire for, substantiality in life is an indication of the divine *signature that pervades everything we seek to rely on.* "The desire is God's summons. God is the source of our desire as well as its term."[85]

As for the third type of call, that which is given out from us to the world, we have scarcely begun to acknowledge it, let alone explore its meaning for us. Despite the uncertainties which surround it, we can be sure that it starts from exactly where we are now, with all the limitations and also the opportunities afforded to us by this situation. John Sachs expresses this powerfully in the following way:

> I myself, as this particular, unique creature, in the totality of my being, with my particular talents, in the reality of my freedom, both its limitations and possibilities in this particular time and place in history, in the abiding significance of my past actions and the open-endedness of the future, and not merely some added task or action which I can accept or refuse, am God's 'specific will.'[86]

This specific will is not predetermined; it arises out of the countless possibilities open to us in the responsible exercise of our freedom. Our blessing of the world and our call to it, start from our admitting God into our lives. As the recently deceased Buber scholar, Pamela Vermes, puts it,

> God takes up his abode wherever he is admitted. And the only dwelling-place which every individual is qualified to prepare for God, and into which he can admit him, is the place, the situation, in which he himself stands.[87]

This admittance is not like grudgingly permitting the immigration of an alien into a foreign land, but welcoming a homecoming, a restoration of right relationships. For just as "Christ's call recontextualises persons into a new meaning-frame,"[88] so our mediating God's call to creation reassembles silent or separate fragments into a symphonic whole. God's spirit has a way of opening up systems that formerly seemed closed, and luring them into new possibilities. If we are in the process of composing a life in partnership with God, on the many levels of our existence, physical, aesthetic, social, intellectual, moral and spiritual, and if we are opening ourselves up through enquiry, wonder, patience and, above all, suffering, then this openness will allow the current of God's grace to pass through us and to permeate all we touch and undergo.[89]

From within a perspective of responding to God's call, conversion, then, is neither an escape from 'lower' levels of our lives, nor a mere addition to them. It requires the transformation of *all* things in our lives and does not allow for a form of Christianity which can be practised, as it were, 'on the side'.[90] In the context of Catholic schools therefore, it follows from this view of vocation that acknowledgement of God as our source and goal must inevitably have a central place in their public life and that religion will have an architectonic role within their curriculum. Church schools in this sense strive to minimise the relegation of religion to the realm of the private option and to counter that marginalization and trivialization referred to by Marsden and Carter.[91]

This notion that we are called by God, and that this calling is constitutive of our being and decisive for our destiny is a central theme within Christian thinking and an element which clearly distinguishes a Christian view on humanity from a secular one. Firstly, this is because the Christian view of the person is one that is theocentric, that is, "it sees human dignity as flowing from the person's relationship with God and not as the result of some quality that human beings possess independently."[92] The theocentric world-view differs from the purely anthropocentric one in that it recontextualises our desire for autonomy, rationality and control, preventing these from being assumed by us to be of absolute and always overriding importance.

Secondly, the notion of a calling reminds us that more is expected of us by God than is simply 'natural'. Human nature begins with a given structure but it is one that is essentially inchoate and incomplete. Any adequate response to God's call is one that actively collaborates in the ongoing task of transcendence. The Christian view of the person goes beyond the secular in that it upholds as the ultimate goals of life not merely development and wholeness but also holiness and perfection.

Thirdly, the theocentric view of the human person deepens our understanding of freedom. Such a view leads one to adopt the position that it is necessary, but not sufficient, to aim for a level of inner stability, harmony and control so that we are not driven by forces, for example, fears, repressed desires, or an excessive need for the approval of others, when we exercise choices or make decisions. Furthermore, it follows from such a view that it is necessary, but not sufficient, for real freedom to be exercised, that we are not subject to external interference or coercion from other individuals or social pressures. However, if, in the exercise of choice, it is insisted that the self must be completely 'untrammelled' and unconstrained, this may fail to take

account of the cumulative effect on us of the acts that we do choose to carry out and of the ends that we pursue or to which we are drawn. As Dwyer says,

> in our decisions we respond to God's offer and demand, and in them we either create the selves we are called to be or lose our way. Our decisions are not merely choices of how to act; they are choices of who to be. The person is not a changeless being who makes decisions about objects or things; rather, we ourselves change profoundly in the decisions we make.[93]

There is another implication of an understanding of the notion of calling as constitutive of personhood, one which introduces an element that could not be accepted from a non-theistic perspective. This is the notion that, within the context of God's call to each of us, we each have a purpose and a mission which is given to us by God, rather than purpose being interpreted as something imposed on our circumstances by us. An understanding of the concept of mission as intrinsic, and not something accidental, to the concept of person, and a belief that what we are depends on what we are called or commissioned to be, seems to undermine the strong commitment to autonomy which is advocated as a principal aim within secular education by setting it in the wider context of a theonomous orientation. We are called to participate in the mission of Christ and our own identity is found in relation to the divine will for us. With Christian educators, this participation in the mission of Christ will express itself in a ministry of witness which enables others "to receive, understand and appropriate the Christian tradition as a means of grace for their own lives, and to join in turn in its witnessing work."[94]

From this Christian perspective which I have just outlined, it would be both short-sighted and self-defeating for us to seek to impose on our lives an overall purpose, or

even worse, a series of disconnected purposes or projects, without reference to or even in defiance of their divine source. But

> when the power of reason is placed within the context of Creation, when 'the whole' toward which we orient ourselves is seen to exist through God's free decision, the sense of the 'I' that we express through our reason is changed. We now understand ourselves as chosen to be, and if we are chosen to be, then the divine wisdom behind that choice defines who we are in a more profound way than any other interaction or determination that could follow.[95]

There are important indications here of the priority which should be given in Catholic education to the notion of vocation, in the various senses which I have outlined above. This notion of vocation clearly goes beyond any secular mandate for careers education and it offers a serious alternative to prevailing perspectives on autonomy. Furthermore, it has the potential to re-orient curriculum content and to govern community priorities. By being set in the context of a comprehensive narrative with application to the multi-dimensional character and social nature of human persons, it also has the capacity to provide for staff and students alike a significant challenge, one which is pedagogic and professional, at the same time as being both personal and political.

4.9 Conclusion

In this chapter I have identified several elements of a worldview informed by Catholic beliefs which, when taken together, provide a foundation for a distinctive approach to education. Central to this worldview is an understanding of the human person interpreted in the light of the Church's teaching about Jesus Christ. In articulating a

Catholic perspective on the human person, I have picked out certain features for comment: the voice of conscience, the formation of character, the notion of the soul, the need for conversion and the offer of salvation. I have considered the interconnectedness of intellectual, moral and spiritual qualities, acknowledged the implications of a Catholic view of the effect of sin on our understanding and freedom of action and suggested a corresponding need in us for a disciplining of our powers and a receptivity to grace. I have noted some implications of the belief that we are made in God's image and I have explored some aspects of what is entailed by a belief in vocation.[96] Clearly, religious beliefs play a central role in Catholic education, to such a degree that, for their proper operation and efficacy, separate religious schooling is advocated by that faith community.

Underlying the Church's desire to maintain separate schools, which allow adequate attention to the elements outlined in this chapter, is a belief that metaphysics, morality and spirituality all need to be integrated into the educational process. As different realms of discourse these should, for purposes of academic analysis, proceed in different ways and at different levels. But, in the context of a holistic education, they should not be totally separate operations. Pupils should be encouraged, according to their maturity and capacity, to discern the truth about reality, to discover a pattern of behaviour which meets their needs and is in tune with that reality, and to be receptive to a relationship with its source. Without such interconnections our metaphysics is difficult to verify; our morality cannot be a proper response to reality, for it falls into the trap of confusing shallow with deeper needs, and blindly seeks to impose itself in a world without ultimate meaning or purpose; and our spirituality can slide into something optional, private, uncritical and ineffective.

Chapters three and four have sought to clarify the key concepts within a Catholic philosophy of education together with the world-view and accompanying understanding of human nature which this philosophy presupposes. Some features of this worldview do not fit in with a secular approach to education, for example, the 'scandal' of Christianity, the necessity for salvation, the role of the church, the call to conversion, the life of prayer and the place of self-sacrifice. Such unfamiliar notions as these can be expected to modify radically the understanding in Catholic schools of key educational notions such as integral human development, rationality and autonomy. The view of human nature outlined here will also have implications for the overall coherence of the curriculum and the culture and ethos of schools.

This set of foundational beliefs and the pattern of educational arrangements currently in place for promoting them are highly contestable in our society. Criticism, both of the theory and of the practice of Catholic education, should prompt Catholic educators to consider carefully the justification and coherence of their claim to a distinctive approach to education. It should also challenge them to address inconsistencies between rhetoric and reality and to attend to any possible side-effects of such a distinctive approach to education, for example, that it is liable to slip into an exclusiveness which contradicts its own philosophy. I explore further, in the following chapters, a possible response to the contested nature of the Catholic philosophy of education as outlined in chapters three and four. The particular concern of the next chapter is to investigate the implications of this claim to distinctiveness for those who work in church schools and to consider what bearing the claim has on both inclusiveness and exclusiveness.

Notes and references for chapter four

[1]See A.B. Morris, 'Academic Performance of Catholic Schools', *School Organisation*, vol. 14, no. 4, 1994, especially pp.81-89.

[2]Quoted by V.A. McClelland in *Society in Conflict : The Value of Education*, edited by Elizabeth Ashton and Brenda Watson, *(Aspects of Education*, Number 51, The University of Hull,1994), p.28. [May's words come from his *Which Way to School?* (Lion Publishing, 1972), p.40.] *Cf.* The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1977, para 29: "Either implicit or explicit reference to a determined attitude to life (Weltanshauung) is unavoidable in education because it comes into every decision that is made."

[3]Fred Inglis, *The Management of Ignorance*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1985, p.47. *Cf.* The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *Lay Catholics in Schools : Witnesses to Faith*, para 18 : "Each type of education is influenced by a particular concept of what it means to be a human person."

[4]See Stanton Jones, 'Recovering the Person', in *Agenda for Educational Change*, edited by John Shortt and Trevor Cooling, Leicester, Apollos, 1997, especially pp. 110-115. Jones articulates an evangelical Christian analysis of the human person which closely matches the one I present here.

[5]For a comparison of Islamic and Christian approaches to understanding personhood, aspects of the curriculum and the purpose of education, see *Religion and Education*, edited by Syed Ali Ashraf and Paul Hirst, Cambridge, The Islamic Academy, 1994, especially pp. 218-236. In these pages Ashraf tentatively outlines a faith-based interpretation of education, one which would be broadly acceptable to people from several major theistic religions.

[6]For example, T.H. McLaughlin succinctly summarises difficulties facing the concept of liberal education : "a neglect of the rootedness of persons and of the role of involvement and engagement for the ability to understand and evaluate a world view such as a religious one; the danger of invoking an unduly abstract and ahistorical conception of rationality, autonomy and the human agent; lack of specification of the character and range of autonomy; the need to encourage reflective commitment as a stage in the development of autonomy; an unreal model of the child as an abstract, rootless chooser, unchanged by the choices made; the problem of specifying criteria for choices; the value of the provision of some initial firm beliefs; the role of the shaping of dispositions and virtues in the development of autonomy; the need to acknowledge a hierarchy of values as an element in a persons' self-identity and self-esteem; the dangers of disorientation arising from a 'babel of values' at school level; the significance of settled conventions for the education of the emotions; the difficulty in identifying a set of ethical principles to underpin the task of the common school."

Parental Rights in Religious Upbringing and RE Within a Liberal Perspective', PhD thesis, University of London Institute of Education, 1990, p.242.

[7]A landmark study of these models is that by Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1974. See appendix 2 for a brief summary of Dulles' work.

[8]For a major reinterpretation of Catholic ecclesiology, critical of both neo-conservative and liberal Catholic approaches, see David Schindler, *Heart of the World, Center of the Church*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark/Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1996.

[9]See below, chapter six.

[10]With regard to the apparent neutrality adopted by liberalism towards the true and the good, "the self-appointed referee turns out to be a contestant in disguise." George Marsden (quoting Lee Hardy), *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1997, p.73.

[11]John Henry Newman *The Idea of a University*, London, Longmans, Green & Co, 1912 (originally published 1852). See especially pp. xvi, 50-51, 70, 113, 137, 441.

[12]*Ibid.*, Discourses III, IV, VIII, IX.

[13]*Ibid.*, pp.471-6; 398. He denied that he wanted to confine, distort or stunt the growth of the intellect by ecclesiastical supervision; rather he advocated a freedom and scope for religious expression and discipline which parallelled that allowed for intellectual expression and discipline. See also Newman's *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, London, Longmans, Green & Co, 1921 (originally published 1857), p. 13.

[14]Newman, *Sermons Preached*, pp.64-68.

[15]*Ibid.*, pp.64-65.

[16]*Ibid.*, p.65. *Cf.* Newman, *University Sermons*, edited and introduced by D.M.MacKinnon and J.D Holmes, London, SPCK, 1970, p.18.

[17]Newman, *A Grammar of Assent*, introduced by Nicholas Lash, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1979, p.331. (originally published 1870) See also Paddy Walsh, *Education and Meaning*, London, Cassell, 1993, especially chapter 8, 'Basing Values on Love of the World'. On the relationship between our way of life and the development of a Christian mind, see David Schindler, *Heart of the World, Center of the Church*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1996, p.38. "Sanctity is not merely an extracurricular concern for academies that would be Catholic, but has something intrinsic to do both with the order within each discipline and the relation among all disciplines." ..*Cf.* Further comments by Schindler (pp.147-8) : "Formation of a truly Catholic mind requires sanctity and thus conversion from sin, which involves participation in the sacramental life of the Church...More generally, seeing the truth implies, at the deepest level, living a life of goodness....The objective-meaning-and-truth dimension of the call to holiness is often overlooked, as though holiness were a

matter 'only' of subjective-volitional life." On the task of holiness comprehending the intelligence, see also Schindler, p.215.

[18]*Ibid.*, pp.9, 247. *Cf.* Newman's *University Sermons*, p.234. where he states that the right state of heart both gives birth to faith and also disciplines it. The right state of heart protects faith "from bigotry, credulity, and fanaticism." On the neglected topic of the spirituality of research and its relationship to Catholic identity, see John Haughey, 'Faculty Research and Catholic Identity', in *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition*, edited by Patrick Carey and Earl Muller, New York, Crossroad, 1997, especially pp.146-150. Haughey picks out six key features of a spirituality of research. These relate to (i) the notion of call, (ii) interiority, (iii) viewing the disciplines as sovereignties (or principalities in the biblical sense), (iv) the common good, (v) stewardship of the goods of information and (vi) discernment. For a more traditional Catholic approach to the spirituality of research, see A. Sertillanges, *The Intellectual Life: Its Spirit, Conditions, Methods*, translated by Mary Ryan, Cork, The Mercier Press, 1946.

[19]For the relation between conversion and objectivity in our knowledge, see my two articles in *Theology*, 'Subjectivity and Religious Understanding,' November 1982, pp.410-417 and 'Lonergan, Conversion and Objectivity,' September 1983, pp.345-353.

[20]See below, (chapters five and seven) for consideration of possible objections to schooling which emphasises the features Newman advocated.

[21]Stephen Carter, *The Culture of Disbelief*, New York, Doubleday/Anchor, 1993; Marsden, *op.cit.* (see note 10, above).

[22]Carter, p.xv.

[23]Carter, *passim*.

[24]Marsden, *op.cit.*, pp.20, 35, 84, 86. 'Methodological atheism' means acting (and theorizing) as if God does not exist, bracketing out the question of the truth of God's existence and relying in one's studies solely on data which can be verified empirically. Marsden borrows the term from Peter Berger, *The Sacred Canopy*, New York, Doubleday/Anchor, 1969, p.100 (and also pp.179-185), although it was not original to him.

[25]*Ibid.*, pp.63-64. Such influence will not exert any predictably direct or uniform effect, for, as Marsden says with reference to Christianity, "influences vary with the type of Christianity, the type of individual, the field and sub-field of scholarship, and the types of traditions of interpretation currently available." (p.70)

[26]*Ibid.*, p.63.

[27]*Ibid.*, p.64.

[28]*Ibid.*, pp.88, 90.

[29]My focus is on a Catholic philosophy of education. Other faith communities may, to varying degrees, share the perception that current arrangements in county schools

(and beyond them in society generally) inhibit both the expression and the development of religious faith and understanding.

[30]A comprehensive analysis of human nature from a theological perspective which is informed by both Catholic and Protestant traditions and which enters into dialogue with key twentieth century (non-religious) philosophers is provided by John Macquarrie in his book *In Search of Humanity*, London, SCM Press, 1982. An alternative reading of more specifically Catholic interpretations of the human condition is that of Rene Latourelle, *Man and His Problems in the Light of Jesus Christ*, New York, Alba House, Society of St Paul, 1983. For a slightly different way of analysing the various constitutive dimensions of human nature, see Kevin Kelly, *New Directions in Moral Theology*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1992, p. 30. Kelly draws from Louis Janssens in outlining eight fundamental dimensions of the human person: (1) a subject; (2) embodied; (3) part of the material world; (4) inter-relational; (5) an interdependent social being; (6) historical; (7) equal but unique; (8) called to know and worship God. Some of the moral implications of a Christian understanding of human persons are brought out by John Crosby : "they should not use each other as instrumental means, or treat each other as mere parts, or as specimens, or as thing-like property, but should rather treat each other as ends in themselves." *The Selfhood of the Human Person*, Washington,DC, Catholic University of America Press, 1996, p.40. After completion of this thesis I have just received a copy of Thomas Groome's magisterial *Educating for Life*, Allen, Texas, Thomas More Press, 1998, which contains a different analysis (on pp.76-86.) of persons: (1) as essentially good and dignified -though capable of sin, remaining in God's image; (2) as body-soul union alive in God's Spirit; (3) as partner with God and ever in need of God's grace; (4) as partner in community; (5) with freedom, rights, and responsibilities; (6) as becoming, knowing, and creating; (7) with divine law written in our nature; (8) as agent-subject who can make history; (9) made from love and for loving; (10) with eternal destiny.

[31]For example, by that most authoritative Catholic philosopher and theologian, Thomas Aquinas, in his *Summa Theologica*. However, the equally influential Christian theologian Augustine was much less confident about the power of human reason and freedom to withstand the urges of desire and the demands of a flawed will.

[32]Edward Farley, 'Can church education be theological education?' in Jeff Astley, Leslie Francis and Colin Crowder, *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1996, p.38.

[33]There have been and are, of course, some secular thinkers, for example, Hobbes in the seventeenth century, Freud at the beginning of this century, who held 'lower' views of human nature, although in both of these cases it could be argued that within their secularism there is a residual element of a Judaeo-Christian mind-set.

[34]Stanley Hauerwas, *A Community of Character*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1981, p.130. He goes on to say that "the translation of the language of perfection into the language of development involves a transformation that robs the language of its religious import." *Ibid.*

[35]*Ibid.*, pp. 130, 131, 271. For an alternative analysis of the relationship between morality and Christianity, one which focuses on context, motivation, model and inspiration, as well as on its character, see Patrick Hannon, *Church, State, Morality & Law*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1992, pp.40, 42.

[36]I say more about autonomy below.

[37]John Redden and Francis Ryan, *A Catholic Philosophy of Education*, Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956, p.vii.

[38]*Ibid.*, p.29. :"True philosophy of education provides, indeed, for complete, legitimate self-improvement and self-realization, but it also enjoins restraint, self-sacrifice and discipline."

[39]*Ibid.*, p.22.

[40]John Crosby, *op. cit.*, pp.41, 65.

[41]See Pope Pius XI, *On Christian Education of Youth (Divini Illius Magistri)*, in *Selected Papal Encyclicals & Letters*, vol. 1, 1896-1931, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1939, p.29. On the previous page Pius XI had claimed that "the chief effects of original sin are weakness of will and disorderly inclinations." More recently it has been said that human responsibility can be "diminished or even nullified by ignorance, inadvertence, duress, fear, habit, inordinate attachments and other psychological or social factors." (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994, p. 389.) See Paddy Walsh's comment on Rousseau's misreading of the doctrine of Original Sin: "[Rousseau's] own project of removing the pupil from society could *just as well* have been presented as one of preventing the exposure of the child to the adult, institutionalized and 'full-blown' manifestations of original sin! The doctrine, it seems to me, is in fact neutral as between traditional and child-centred positions on education." Walsh, *Education and Meaning*, London, Cassell, 1993, p.100.

[42]For an intimation that the sense of the eternal and the infinite are not merely brought *to* human lives (as foreign imports, as it were) through the medium of certain religious beliefs, but are rather already *immanent within* human experience, as revealed in an endless restlessness and questioning, a passion for ultimacy and a sense of the infinite, see Crosby, *op.cit.*, pp. 161, 162, 164. Catholic liberation theologians (for example, Leonardo Boff or Gustavo Gutierrez,) might wish to 'up-grade' the importance of this-worldly concerns by comparison with some traditional emphases.

[43]Redden and Ryan, *op.cit.*, p.56. Truth is not easily available to all through simple inspection, nor is objectivity attained outside a moral lifestyle. As Kotva suggests, "humility and imagination are often necessary to 'objectivity'. Humility provides an ability to hear others and does not immediately assume the supremacy of one's own position. Imagination allows us to understand how the situation or data might be viewed differently." Where transgression has occurred and where reconciliation is needed, wise decisions (which attain to some form of 'moral truth') require a combination of compassion, justice, imagination and fortitude. "Without compassion

and justice the need for an alternative would not be seen. Without imagination an alternative would not be found. Without fortitude the alternative would not be given a chance." Joseph Kotva, 'Christian Virtue Ethics and the "Sectarian Temptation"', *The Heythrop Journal*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1994, pp.46-47. For a penetrating discussion of the sources, scope and effects of sin, see James Keenan, 'The Problem with Thomas Aquinas's Concept of Sin', *The Heythrop Journal*, vol. 35, no. 4, 1994, pp.401-420. *Cf.* the teaching in *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* (*op.cit.*, p.398) that conscience can be almost blinded by inappropriate habits or by sin: "Ignorance of Christ and his Gospel, bad example given by others, enslavement to one's passions, assertion of a mistaken notion of autonomy of conscience, rejection of the Church's authority and her teaching, lack of conversion and of charity: these can be at the source of errors of judgement in moral conduct."

[44]Among others we could cite here: Colossians 3. 10, on having to put on a new nature; 2 Corinthians 3: 18 on being changed into God's likeness; (cf Romans 8: 29); 2 Corinthians 5:17 on identification with Christ helping us to overcome our sinful nature and our self-destruction; 1 Corinthians 2:16 on having the mind of Christ; 2 Peter 1:4 on being sharers in the divine nature.

[45]Matthew 16:15; Mark 8:29; Luke 9:20.

[46]Michael Himes, 'Catholicism as Integral Humanism : Christian Participation in Pluralistic Moral Education', in *The Challenge of Pluralism*, edited by F. Clark Power and Daniel Lapsley, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1992, p. 123.

[47]*Ibid.* Himes develops this further. "There is an intimate connection between the Gospel and the process of humanization...The more fully one has explored and cultivated one's capacities as a human being, the readier one is to hear the Gospel...This care for the development of the whole human person as part of the necessary propaedeutic to the gospel includes the intellectual, physical, social, political, and economic well-being of the person." (pp.126,127, 130.)

[48]Several comments by Crosby are relevant here: "[W]e can approach the interpersonal life of God through our own interpersonal life...This partial dependency of our self-knowledge on some partial knowledge of God is very expressive of the theonomy of the human person...[The person] recognizes himself fully as a person not directly through himself, but in part through his relation to and his encounter with God...To believe that I am known by God, willed by Him, called by name, taken seriously by Him, held accountable by Him, is to have an overwhelming experience of personal selfhood." Crosby, *op.cit.*, p.301.

[49]The natural and the supernatural "are not two lives juxtaposed within us; but the latter raises the former to itself, co-ordinates its values and ends, and synthesizes it in its own form....Just as within us the vegetative life is integrated with the sense life, making not two lives but one, the higher affecting the rhythm of the lower, and just as the sense life is integrated with the intellective life, making again a single life, the higher affecting the rhythm of the lower, so the supernatural life integrates the whole of natural human life, making of it a single life inasmuch as it affects the rhythm of all

human faculties." Luigi Sturzo, *The True Life*, London, Geoffrey Bles, 1947, pp.27, 36. Sturzo goes on to quote St Paul: "It is no longer I that live, but Christ lives in me" (Gal 2.20).

[50]For a detailed analysis on this topic, see Joel Kupperman, *Character*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991. In recent moral philosophy the subject of character has enjoyed a revival of interest, largely in the wake of a renewed emphasis on the role of virtues in the moral life, prompted particularly by Alasdair MacIntyre. See his *After Virtue*, (1981), *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* (1988), and *Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry* (1990), all published by Duckworth, London.

[51]Joseph Dunne, "Philosophies of the Self and the Scope of Education", in Papers of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1995, pp.170-180; see particularly pp.171-4.

[52]*Ibid.*, p.174.

[53]Dunne's point that "the enacted narrative of my life meshes too finely with the narratives of other lives (themselves similarly meshed) for it to be subject to my sole construction: I am the main protagonist in it but not the author of it," can be compared with T.H. Groome's detailed articulation of Christian praxis, where our own personal stories are related to the larger Christian story and both our own stories and that of the Christian community reinterpreted in the light of each other. See Thomas Groome, *Christian Religious Education : Sharing Our Story and Vision*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1981 and also his *Sharing Faith*, San Francisco, HarperCollins, 1991.

[54]Nicholas Dent, *The moral psychology of the virtues*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984, p.12.

[55]Another option might be an altruistic humanism which encouraged, for example, a concern for justice and the promotion of citizenship.

[56]"In setting up as ideal the fulfilment of the individual's psychic needs and the maximal achievement of his potential, [an excessive emphasis on self-realization] renders essential Christian attitudes of sacrifice and abnegation obsolete....the self [is not the] sole source of meaning." Louis Dupre, 'Catholic Education and the Predicament of Modern Culture', *The Living Light*, vol. 23, no. 4, 1987, p. 301.

[57]Michael Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982, p.179; quotation from p.56.

[58]Craig Dykstra, *Vision and Character*, New York, Paulist Press, 1981, p.3.

[59]Crosby brings out how my 'outward thrust' is 'anchored in interiority'. "The stronger my self-presence, the more I can enter into the object outside me; my self-presence does not compete with my transcendence towards the object but rather renders this transcendence possible and perfects it." *op.cit.*, pp.84-85.

[60]The limitations on freedom are not minor. "We can forget, make mistakes, are sometimes ignorant of truth; and sometimes our judgement is clouded by excess of emotion or by factors deep in our psychology of which we may not even be

conscious. Our freedom is always bounded by our knowledge..and by our environment." Patrick Hannon, *Church, State, Morality & Law*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1992, pp.16-17. Hannon stresses (p.17.) that both deprived and privileged environments can restrict our freedom to recognize the truth.

[61]"The educator must evoke wonder before defining mystery in doctrine..[and] elicit astonishment...Openness and surprise should mark the entire educational process." Dupre, *loc.cit.*, 302.

[62]If we "offer no resistance to our cravings, urges, wants, we are dethroned as persons...living at beck and call of one's latest strongest desires one loses the dominion over self which is due to oneself as person." (Crosby, *Selfhood, op.cit*, p.189.) *cf.* St Paul : Romans 7:15, 20, 22-23.

[63]*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994, p.389.

[64]The *Catechism* goes on to identify the source of errors, which can stem from any or all of the following: "ignorance of Christ and his Gospel, bad example given by others, enslavement to one's passions, assertion of a mistaken notion of autonomy of conscience, rejection of the Church's authority and her teaching, lack of conversion and of charity." *Ibid.*, p.398.

[65]"The language of wholeness, personal fulfilment, competence and liberation is explicitly challenged by a Christian understanding of what is fundamental to human life - salvation." Clare Watkins, 'A Christian theology of models of education', in *Tomorrow is Another Country : education in a post-modern world*, Board of Education of the General Synod of the Church of England, Church House Publishing, London, 1996, p.48.

[66]See, for example, H. Skolimowski, *Living Philosophy*, London, Arkana, 1992); R. Bellah et al, *Habits of the Heart*, London, Hutchinson, 1988; D. Selbourne, *The Principle of Duty*, London, Sinclair Stevenson, 1994; A. MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, London, Duckworth, 1985.

[67]C. Gunton, *The One, The Three and The Many*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993, p.187.

[68]J. Maritain, *Education at the Crossroads*, Yale University Press, 1943, pp. 8-9. *cf.* Maritain's *The Person and the Common Good*, London, Geoffrey Bless, 1948, pp.24, 31. He uses the following analogy to bring out how we can justly express something in two different (but not contradictory) ways: "the whole of a painting is a physico-chemical mixture by reason of the colouring stuff of which it is made, and the whole of it is a work of beauty by reason of the painter's art." (Maritain, *The Person*, p.31.) As material beings, individuals are subject to "the determinism of the physical world. Nonetheless, each of us is also a person and, as such, is not controlled by the stars." *Ibid.*, p.27.

[69]Maritain, *Education*, p.34.

[70]"Man must realise through his will that of which his nature is but a sketch." *Ibid.*, p.31. *Cf.* Crosby, *op.cit.*, p.181. : "The will is not from the beginning and by its very

nature directed to *bonum*; it is I who direct it to *bonum*; it is a fundamental task of my freedom to direct it to *bonum*." Crosby, unhappy with Maritain's contrast between individuality and personhood, because he wants to allow for the fullness of individuality to be taken up and expressed in personhood, prefers to contrast nature and person: the first relates to what happens *in* us, the second relates to what we do with what is in us. In the first we are passive objects of experience; in the second we are agents in our own right. Crosby, *op.cit.*, p.38.

[71]Maritain, *Education*, p.34. This interior selfhood is not to be confused with subjectivity; it is closer to what was described earlier in my analysis of the development of character.

[72]*Ibid.*

[73]See, for example, The Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *The Common Good*, Manchester, Gabriel Communications, 1996 and Catholic Education Service, *The Common Good in Education*, London, 1997. These two documents are considered in chapter five, below. *Cf.* Vincent Nichols, 'The Church's Mission in a Multi-faith Society': "An atmosphere of unfettered competition, or trial by strength, is in contrast to the spirit of compassion and mutual responsibility which our Gospel requires." (in *Partners in Mission*, Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1997, p.46.); David Konstant, 'The Church and Catholic Independent Schools': "being part of ...that 'community of communities' which is the mark of Catholic education in this country...involves a care for the good of the whole as well as of the individual parts." (*Ibid.*, p.67.); Vincent Nichols, 'Grant Maintained Status of Schools', *ibid.*, pp.124, 127, where several of the Church's anxieties about the potentially damaging effects of a market approach to education are outlined, particularly those relating to an increase in inequality, the weakening of local democratic structures and the encouragement of schools to go their own way, ignoring the needs and interests of others.

[74]Jane Kopas, *Sacred Identity*, New York, Paulist Press, 1994, p. 145. For a powerful defence of the worth of people not being dependent upon either their personal success and achievement or their contribution to the lives of others, see David Pailin, *A Gentle Touch*, London, SPCK, 1992. His central thesis is that "a person's significance is not determined by the value of what she or he contributes to other people's experiences...The fundamental worth of each human being lies neither in what a person achieves nor in what a person makes possible for others to achieve, but in God's love for that person" (pp.13, 95). Cf John Wilson's comment that we should: "disengage self-esteem from undue attachment to particular performances." (Papers of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1995, p. 158.)

[75]"We believe that each person possesses a basic dignity that comes from God, not from any human quality or accomplishment, not from race or gender, age or economic status." Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *The Common Good and the Catholic Church's Social Teaching*, Manchester, Gabriel Communications, 1996, para 13. My comments about appropriate distance between

teachers and pupils provide a foundation for my treatment of inclusiveness as a pedagogical virtue in chapter five.

[76]Alain Vergnioux, 'Education, Time and Liberty,' Papers of Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, April 1995, p. 164, where he also says "distance is the condition of liberty, of the learning and exercising it."

[77]As Anthony and Richard Hanson put it, "man is a creature of convictions, obligations and vocations. It is in this sphere that his true freedom lies." *Reasonable Belief*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1981, p.149.

[78]Cf. the barriers to the exercise of personal capacities (and therefore the obstacles to freedom) outlined by Richard Pring: "ignorance, false beliefs, lack of self-respect, envy or hatred of others, absence of the skills of social relationships, blindness to the goods which will arise from the exercise of that capacity, lack of vision to guide these deliberations." (*Closing the Gap: Liberal education & vocational preparation*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1995, p.127.)

[79]Richard Pring, *op.cit.*, pp.128-130. Cf. Pring's *Personal and Social Education*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1984, which has a more extended analysis of the constituent elements of personhood.

[80]These last two sentences summarise the more substantial and carefully argued essay, 'Liberal & Vocational Education: A conflict of value', in the Victor Cook Lectures, 'Education, Values and the State', edited by John Haldane, University of St Andrews, 1994, pp.7-41.

[81]Pring, *Closing the Gap*, p.134.

[82]K. Kelly, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

[83]A. McFadyen, *The call to personhood*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990, pp.29,30.

[84]Aidan Nichols, *Byzantine Gospel : Maximus the Confessor in Modern Scholarship*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1993, p.168.

[85]Stephen Duffy, *The Graced Horizon*, Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 1991, p.106. The theme of human restlessness requiring God as the only source of satisfaction was expressed most powerfully and memorably by Augustine in his *Confessions*.

[86]J. Sachs, *The Christian Vision of Humanity*, Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 1991, p.106.

[87]P. Vermes, *Buber on God and the Perfect Man*, Scholars Press, 1980, p.180.

[88]A. McFadyen, *op.cit.*, p.57.

[89]Vermes summarises the Hasidic recipe for the sanctification of our present existence: "cleave to God, worship God, in humility, joy, with holy intention and love. Know yourself, begin with yourself, avoid concentrating on yourself, be resolute, find your particular vocation, make your own place holy by admitting God into it so that he may be present with you there." (*loc. cit.*)

[90]James Loder 'Transformation in Christian education' in Astley, Francis and Crowder (1996), *op.cit.*, p.278. says "the threat that Christianity posed to Rome was vastly greater than, say, Mithraism or any other sort of cultic conversion since one could , so to say, be a Mithraist on the side." (Loder is summarising an idea from A.D.Nock, *Conversion*, Oxford University Press, 1952.)

[91]See notes 10 and 21, above.

[92]John Dwyer, in *The New Dictionary of Catholic Social Thought*, edited by J.A. Dwyer and E.L. Montgomery, Collegeville, Minnesota, Liturgical Press, 1994, p.724.

[93]*Ibid.*, p.731., where he continues:"freedom is not the absence of limiting and constraining factors in our lives; it is the ability and the power to make use of them. [They are the] raw material we are summoned to use in becoming free."

[94]Charles Wood, 'Theological education and education for church leadership' in Astley, Francis and Crowder (1996), *op.cit.*, p.304.

[95]Robert Sokolowski, *Eucharistic Presence*, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of America Press, 1994, p. 130.

[96]I would expect a Catholic school to ensure that, in the course of its personal and social education programme, proper consideration is given to the notion of vocation, both in its specifically religious sense and in its broader, work-related sense, in order that pupils explore the possible interconnections between their talents and inclinations, the needs of others and God's particular call to each of us.

CHAPTER FIVE

Inclusiveness and Exclusiveness

In chapters two to four I focused on central features of the *content* of the claim that there is within Catholicism a distinctive philosophy of education and of life. Here, while acknowledging that there can be no absolute demarcation between the content of a claim and what its adherents believe should follow from it, I draw out some of the *implications* of this claim by focusing on various ways that this distinctiveness might be expressed in broad policy issues or in particular practices in Catholic schools. The main aim of the chapter is to explore how the claim to be distinctive coheres with the parallel claim that Catholic education is essentially inclusive. After analysing different meanings of the term 'inclusiveness' and its correlative 'exclusiveness' - and indicating in the process some of the factors which have had a bearing on a deepening understanding of and commitment to inclusiveness in education - I argue that many aspects of inclusiveness are compatible with Catholic principles; that some aspects are essential to such principles, but that other aspects present problems for Catholic educators.[1] Some kinds of inclusiveness necessarily follow from a Catholic perspective and are intrinsic to Catholic education. Other aspects are accepted as part of a set of liberal principles that do not depend upon Catholic beliefs, but which do not contradict them either.

This situation also applies to practices which should be *excluded* from Catholic schools: some of these would be excluded in any school which seeks to exemplify liberal principles; others would be excluded because they conflict with a Catholic worldview. Some kinds of exclusiveness are necessarily entailed by the claim of Catholic education to be distinctive. Many kinds of exclusiveness would, however, be quite incompatible with Catholic principles.

These points might be outlined more schematically. In relation to Catholic Christianity, forms of inclusion may be: (1) distinctively (i.e. exclusively) required: *only* Catholics must include this feature; (2) essentially, but not exclusively, required: Catholics and others must include this feature; (3) compatible with, but not required: an acceptable, but not a necessary inclusion; (4) incompatible. Similarly, with regard to Catholic Christianity, forms of exclusion may reflect any one of these four types. Such an analysis would require extensive justification and exemplification. However, my aim here is not provide a detailed and comprehensive mapping of *all* the various forms of inclusion and exclusion possible in Catholic education. Instead I merely wish to demonstrate that a Catholic philosophy of education is compatible with *a sufficient number* of forms of inclusiveness (considered normative from religious and educational perspectives) to justify the claim that *in several respects a Catholic education can be (and should be) both distinctive and inclusive*. For the purposes of this thesis, therefore, I do not need to allocate specifically each form of inclusion (or exclusion) referred to into the precise categories outlined above.

5.1.1 Inclusive and exclusive language

In contemporary society the terms 'exclusive language' and 'inclusive language' are sometimes employed to distinguish modes of speaking to and about others which have either negative or positive intentions or effects. If someone is accused of using exclusive language, it is implied that such a person does one or more of the following: they ignore or downgrade the experience of their audience; they use pronouns, metaphors or examples which refer too narrowly to the experience of some of those to whom or about whom they are speaking, as if they were either invisible or

unimportant; they make assumptions about roles, qualities and insights which are unduly limiting in their provenance and scope. This could apply in matters of different race, gender, religious faith, class, ability, nationality, sexual orientation or political persuasion.

If you use language which excludes me in some way, for example, in the contexts of church liturgy or preaching, school assembly or classroom, political speeches, or even in informal conversations at parties or in public houses, then you leave out part of what is essential to me; you have assumed, prematurely and in a prejudicial manner, *something about me which is inaccurate, incomplete or simply unjust.* In that process I feel diminished and your message is made more alien to me than it might appear otherwise. You have distanced yourself from me and at the same time reduced the relevance to me of your communication. By granting, at least implicitly, a privileged position to some perspective which does not include me, you have made it more difficult for me to enter into this area of discussion as an equal, to feel that I have *anything worth contributing (or at least anything which I anticipate will be taken* seriously by you); you have made me more of an 'outsider', an inferior, of less account. As a result of your stance I may then be tempted, in order to become acceptable, to omit or even to deny crucial aspects of my experience and identity, or to concede principles which I do not really hold to, thereby slipping into inauthenticity.[2]

Part of what is entailed by being inclusive, then, seems to be the displaying of certain attitudes to others: respect, openness, welcome, acceptance and the desire to provide access to what we have on offer and also protection against discrimination. A positive view of difference is built into the idea of inclusiveness: those who are different will be recognised and responded to in a positive way.

5.1.2 Inclusiveness normative from a Christian perspective

Many kinds of inclusiveness, like those just mentioned, do not derive directly from a particular faith perspective. I shall explore more of these later in the chapter, especially when I analyse the teacher-pupil relationship. In the particular context of Catholic education I believe that many kinds of inclusiveness are entailed by the distinctive worldview which I outlined in chapter four. Among these I pick out ten forms of openness or inclusiveness which stem from a broadly Christian religious perspective and which should be considered normative for Catholic education. I list these without assuming that they are all actually present in particular schools.[3]

First, there is an openness to the grace of God (on the basis that we are not self-sufficient, either individually or communally). Second, there is an openness to the promptings of the Holy Spirit, who leads us continually and more fully into truth and who cannot be confined to the working of the visible church. Third, there is an awareness of and response to the needs of others, whoever and wherever they are, including all types of needs, this inclusiveness demonstrating a concern for the well-being of others in all the diversity of their needs. Fourth, there is an inclusiveness of sinners, which involves an avoidance of premature judgement and of elitism, in favour of patience, forgiveness and tolerance (all under the aspect of compassion, not of justification). Fifth, there is an openness to and a respect for the autonomy of different sources of knowledge, that is, an avoidance of theological imperialism and an acknowledgement that reason is not contradicted by revelation but rather is both complemented and reframed in its light. Sixth, there is an openness to political realities and a recognition of the need to cooperate with others of different persuasions. Seventh, there is a willingness to engage in inter-religious dialogue and

ecumenism and to equip others to do so as a central aim of education. Eighth, inclusiveness is shown by inculturation, taking cultures seriously, distinguishing culture from the heart of religion and being ready to adapt the cultural expressions employed by the Church, thereby facilitating a synthesis between faith and cultures.[4] Ninth, there is an openness to the need for ongoing internal reformation of the Church and, as part of this, an openness to the need for constant development in our understanding of doctrine, so that fresh expressions of faith are encouraged in order to link up more effectively with, and to cast more light upon, the different aspects of peoples' lives and thereby facilitate a synthesis of faith and life. Tenth, inclusiveness is demonstrated not only by the facilitation of a harmonious internal pluralism in the life of the Church (as against the enforcement of uniformity or a premature polarisation of views) but also by a level of trust which allows subsidiarity to be taken seriously within the Church.

All of these forms of inclusiveness, except those indicated in points six and ten, are implicit either within one or more of the key elements of Catholic education (as outlined in chapter three) or in one or more aspects of the Catholic worldview (as articulated in chapter four). The sixth form of openness can be said to have dictated in England and Wales the Church's acceptance of the dual system (described in chapter two), runs through several of the Bishops' documents on Catholic education and is addressed further in chapter seven, below, when I consider the possible contribution of Catholic schools to the common good in the context of a plural and largely secular society.[5] The tenth form of inclusiveness is, to a degree, implicit in my treatment of living tradition and subsidiarity in later chapters. It will be apparent that, of these ten forms of openness or inclusiveness, some will be fully endorsed by people who do not consider themselves religious, for example numbers three and six, several will be a matter of supreme indifference to them, for example, numbers one, two, seven, nine and ten; while others will meet with a cautious welcome, mingled with a

degree of perplexity, for example numbers four, five and eight. All of these forms of inclusiveness, in one way or another, have a bearing upon both school policy and classroom practice.

5.1.3 Differentiation

In the context of education the idea of differentiation is familiar: a planned process of intervention in the classroom to maximise potential based on individual needs. Teachers approach differentiation in several ways. They make allowances for individuals' difficulties and handicaps to learning, whether there are academic, social or personal. They provide different resources, set different tasks, provide differing levels of support, look for different responses or outcomes in order to increase the chances that the learning needs of all their pupils will be met and that all pupils have an opportunity to have access to and make progress through the curriculum. It is possible to speak of

> differentiation in teaching styles, in the pacing of lessons (i.e. allowing different pupils to work at different speeds), in the level of the curriculum goals, in the type of response expected of pupils, in the curricular sequence, in the structure of lessons, in grouping arrangements and in the time devoted to different pupils.[6]

Such efforts have been boosted since 1994 by the Code of Practice on the identification and assessment of Special Educational Needs.[7] Teachers are also encouraged (through school policies relating to equal opportunities and through inspection) to demonstrate how they are matching their plans, resources, approaches and procedures to the diverse needs of pupils, taking into account differences in academic ability, age, gender, physical disability, ethnicity, religious belief and socio-economic circumstances.[8]

The notion of differentiation has not often been applied to religious differences in the context of a church school. Differentiation in religious education, and further, with regard to the permeation of the religious ethos throughout the curriculum and the life of the school, presents one of the greatest challenges for Catholic schools at the end of the twentieth century. Instead of focusing on the *universal* nature of God's revelation, as mediated through the teaching, worship, service and community life of the church, differentiation draws attention to the fact that it is addressed to the diversity of *particular* lives.

This is why rhetoric as well as logic is required; for rhetoric, as an art of moral communication, entails taking particular audiences into account, and without seeking to manipulate them, takes account of their circumstances, priorities, concerns and values in an effort to 'move' them and to make the Gospel accessible and attractive.[9] In the context of the church's capacity to apply the principles of differentiation to her communication of the message of salvation, the notion of rhetoric is linked closely with that of 'reception'. Concern about 'reception' of the church's teaching acts as a moderating influence on the usual focus on 'promulgation' and brings out the need for the church to be a listening and learning church.[10]

The more inclusive attitude displayed in the practice of differentiation stems partly from greater respect for the dignity and uniqueness of each person and partly from a recognition of incompleteness within the church. There is less presumption of a radical separation between the members of the church who have authority to teach in its name and those who are expected to learn from this teaching.[11] Teachers who do not recognize the uniqueness of each pupil and the gift that she or he has to bring to the classroom are likely to obstruct learning. Presumptive language, which assumes,

for example, that all pupils have the same level of faith-commitment, can be exclusive, alienating and anti-educational.[12] As Jim Gallagher says, "we have to recognize that each journey of faith is unique and we have to respect that each pupil has a different starting place and will have his or her own pace for the journey."[13] This recognition merely echoes the comment in *Catechesi Tradendae* that "Catholic establishments should respect freedom of conscience" and that they have a duty "to offer a religious training suited to the often widely varying religious situations of the pupils."[14] Pupils will be at different levels of readiness for and responsiveness to or even rejection of faith. Catholic schools should seek to adopt an inclusive approach to all of them.[15] This inclusive approach will build on and express those features of inclusiveness already listed as normative from a faith perspective[16] and those required pedagogically by differentiation. These two sources mutually reinforce one another in the respect shown to and the attempt to meet the needs of pupils.[17]

A highly inclusive response by the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales to religious pluralism in Catholic schools is the recently issued *Catholic Schools & Other Faiths*.[18] Here a close connection is suggested between fidelity to tradition and the nurturing of faith, the promotion of dialogue and openness, and service to the community. These three aims for Catholic education are seen as intimately interrelated. Such an emphasis implies a radical re-thinking of the purpose of Catholic schools, one which differs considerably from the more inward-looking and protective form of Catholic education predominant earlier this century.

The more inclusive emphasis requires an education which develops the attitudes, insights and skills which facilitate dialogue and encounter with people of a variety of faith stances and partnership with their respective communities. This emphasis derives not from an abandonment or loss of confidence in the clear identity and

distinctive features of Catholic education, but rather from an interpretation of these which requires, as an essential and constituent element of them, a high degree of openness to the perspectives and needs of others. *Catholic Schools & Other Faiths* makes a strong case for sensitivity to be shown to people of other faiths and for careful safeguarding of their interests in the drawing up of school policies. In the guidance notes accompanying the document the practical implications of such concern are drawn for Catholic schools. These include arrangements for assemblies, personal and social education, religious education, the content and treatment of other curriculum areas, admissions criteria, support for the culture and values of families from other faiths, for instance, with regard to feasts, fasts, prayer, diet, dress, and cooperation with their spiritual leaders.[19] This kind of sensitivity is founded upon principles originally articulated in the documents emanating from the Second Vatican Council.[20] *Catholic Schools & Other Faiths* might be said to represent a direct application of these conciliar documents to the context of Catholic schools in late twentieth century England and Wales[21] and a deliberate attempt to promote a more inclusive style of involvement in the world.

5.1.4 Inclusiveness: influences and constraints

The practice of labelling language as 'exclusive' or 'inclusive' stems from a range of changes in our society. Among other factors one might attribute such labelling to an ever-deepening penetration of our understanding of liberal democracy, and the sources and contexts which enhance or obstruct its operations. In order to grant others an appropriate degree of freedom and to treat them as of equal worth[22] one must listen to their stories, enter into their perspectives, learn from their experiences, be challenged by their 'otherness' and be enriched by their differences. Progress in the

social sciences[23] helps us to appreciate the various rationales behind differing ways of doing things, 'seeing' things and prioritising among them.

Yet among the sources contributing to a growing emphasis on inclusiveness one might also mention both a developing understanding of the implications of the Christian Gospel, together with alternative interpretations of what is meant by church, and fresh understandings of what is required for a properly educational relationship in school settings.[24] With regard to the first of these sources we could claim that, as a result of the 'preferential option for the poor', liberation theology, developments in the church's social teaching and an increasing emphasis on inclusiveness in the theology of religions, greater emphasis is now placed on the all-embracing scope of the Gospel and its application to people of all races, classes, and conditions.[25] Feminist theology is, in this context at least, part of a wider move to interpret the Gospel as a story which liberates us from all that enslaves us and as a text which liberates us for a life that is more fully human.[26]

Taken together, these secular and religious factors contribute to a greater emphasis on inclusiveness. In a truly educational relationship which displays the quality of inclusiveness, there will be room for dialogue and reciprocity. The influences I have mentioned which emphasise the importance of inclusiveness within education have prompted fresh understandings of equal opportunities, of the community dimension of schooling and of the kind of curriculum to be pursued by pupils.

There cannot, of course, be an unqualified kind of openness or inclusiveness in education. This is for several reasons. First, there are other qualities competing for our allegiance as aspects of good education. These include, for example, clarity in communication, stability and persistence in the values pursued, accuracy in

scholarship, the attainment of nationally agreed standards, focusing on curriculum content which has both high value in the eyes of the general public (which pays for education through their taxes) and which has strong epistemological warrant for being conveyed as valid knowledge. To these must be added critical distance and objectivity and a degree of detachment from being swamped by current feelings and fashions and local circumstances.[27] One cannot expect inclusiveness to override all these, but instead to take its place alongside them. Indeed, it might be argued that 'inclusiveness' is based upon them.

Second, and related to the first point, as Siegel points out, "there is no necessary connection between inclusion and epistemic worthiness, or between exclusion and epistemic defectiveness."[28] Epistemology and social justice are separate issues and operate on different levels, although it may well be the case that sometimes an exclusive outlook which disregards social justice has been a factor in the failure to take proper account of the full range of potential evidence relating to a question. Teachers must demonstrate the authority of truth and of objective criteria in their classroom exchanges if they are to help their pupils to develop. To accept any view which is put forward by pupils as valid, on the basis of a superficial understanding of inclusiveness, may cause a child to remain in ignorance or with a distorted view when this could have been avoided. It is necessary to heed Siegel's reminder that, "treating a person with respect is compatible with regarding his or her views as unjustified or false."[29]

Third, as soon as the notions of standards and criteria are allowed into educational planning and pedagogy, in order to guide the intentions or goals of educators and their practice of assessing pupil progress, immediately questions arise about the relevance of competence, expertise and qualifications to participation in some educational activities.[30] It is not a fundamental attack on anyone's dignity to say that, on

particular issues, which require prior training, particular experience or specialist knowledge, not all views can count as equal or even receive serious consideration.

A fourth constraint on the degree of inclusiveness in the classroom comes from the inability of teachers to escape entirely from the limitations of their own setting and worldview.[31] There will be some things they cannot envisage because of particular features in their upbringing, education and training, their mandate (from government and governors) and in the prevailing assumptions of their time and culture. Much of this will influence their conduct without their being conscious of it. In addition, having deliberately committed themselves to certain principles and values as having overriding authority over them, (perhaps inclusiveness being one of these) some topics will be ruled out as too trivial to deserve time in school, some views will be denied scope for articulation on the grounds that they are demeaning of human dignity or endanger communal harmony, and some kinds of behaviour will be forbidden as inherently damaging both to those who indulge and to others who are affected by such indulgence. Hence, tiddlywinks, bestiality, racism, bullying and drug-taking are not promoted in the curriculum.

These limits to inclusiveness do not undermine its importance in education. Any deepening in our understanding of its nature and role in education is likely to be influenced by a growing realisation that our openness to God cannot be separated from our openness to others. In his influential Reith lectures Jonathan Sacks commented:

> I believe that our capacity to recognise the 'wholly Other' that is God is measured by our ability to recognise the image of God that resides in the person who is not like us: the human 'wholly other.'...To have faith in God as creator and ruler of the universe is to

> do more than believe that God has spoken to us. It is to believe that God has spoken to others, in a language which we may not understand.[32]

The argument might be that God is fully open to all and so, if we wish to be open to God, then we will need to display openness to all, without reservation or resentment. Furthermore, if we are taking our cue from what we believe about God's way with us and with others, then there will be a sense in which this openness is simultaneously discriminating and non-discriminating. It is non-discriminating in that all, without exception, are embraced by God's grace and invited by his call. Yet it is discriminating in the sense that God's universal invitation is adapted to the uniqueness of each individual, so that each is fed in a way that is proportionate to her or his capacities, aspirations and needs.[33]

5.1.5 The Gospel imperative for inclusiveness and its challenge to Catholic schools

The imperative from the Gospels is both universal and all-embracing: the call is to all nations; and everything which Jesus taught is to be conveyed.[34] The inclusiveness which flows from such a universalism should be treated, according to Michael Barnes, a leading Catholic spokesperson on inter-faith relations, less as a system than as an 'instinct'.[35] Continuities and discontinuities between different faiths should be recognized and an allowance made for the mysterious workings of the Holy Spirit within and beyond all faiths. Such an inclusive instinct will avoid any patronising.[36] Our seeking for a link between Christ's Word and the 'other words' which come from God in various ways entails neither a lack of loyalty to nor a compromise with our own tradition.[37] Our main priority should surely be to exhibit a constant openness to the activity of God rather than a faithfulness to the tradition, even if we believe that this tradition articulates definitively our understanding of the nature and purpose of God's ways.[38]

The tension within Christianity between an exclusive and an inclusive emphasis stems from the combination of the universal and the particular; the Gospel might be addressed to all peoples and might touch upon all aspects of their existence; but nevertheless, as a continuation of the incarnational principle, it is carried forward through particular traditions and embedded in particular communities which are located in time and space. If faith has an eternal dimension, yet it is rooted in history. If there are constant foundations or principles which withstand the test of time, for example, the person of Jesus Christ, the teaching of the Gospels, the accumulated moral and spiritual wisdom of tradition, the carefully worked out and intricately intermeshed body of doctrine, nevertheless the circumstances of the people to whom the 'story' is addressed are constantly changing. Our context and culture, our predicament and problems remain in a state of flux.

Inclusiveness is also required, then, because the 'story' is 'unfinished', open to further development. For the ongoing completion of creation and redemption, which remains for us in the future, not only are tradition and heritage required, communities of memory, but also innovation and creativity, communities of anticipation.[39] There will be a creative tension between these two, with memory cherished for the sake of the future and with anticipation fostered as the rightfully to be hoped for harvest from the past. Another way of putting this is to refer to the need for a double form of hermeneutics, the first requiring 'retrieval' and the second requiring 'hospitality'. 'Retrieval' preserves a heritage; it rescues what is essential from the particular historical tradition and ensures continuity. 'Hospitality' prevents insularity; it ensures that a concern for memory and heritage does not slip into a backward-looking, inflexible or exclusivist stance. It displays a "readiness to welcome strange and unfamiliar

meanings into our own awareness, perhaps to be shaken by them, but in no case to be left unchanged."[40]

One important educational implication here is that the whole curriculum has the potential to provide a context for an encounter with God. Religion is not to be confined to one aspect of the curriculum; it must reach out beyond a protected 'slot' if it is to be true to itself. Yet religion is also to be challenged and enriched by dialogue with other curriculum areas. As Nicholas Lash puts it,

> If Christianity is a school for the production of persons in relation to the unknown God through discipleship of the crucified, then there is *nothing* (his emphasis) that we do and suffer, think, or feel, or undergo, which may not contribute to such schooling. It follows that there is no single activity, or cluster of activities, which alone counts as 'Christian teaching."[41]

Such a holistic approach to the curriculum entailed by Catholicism's inclusive spirituality would rule out as deficient the dualistic kind of Catholic school described by James Arthur.[42] If there is no sustained attempt to integrate faith and culture in the religious and secular curriculum, then a school is, from a Catholic point of view, insufficiently inclusive in its approach.

Another dimension of that inclusiveness which should be a constitutive feature of Catholic education is indicated in the Gospels. A recurring theme there is Jesus's ministry to outsiders, the poor and the rejected. Likewise Catholic education should include those who are deviants, sinners, unorthodox, unpopular, unsuccessful, disabled, that is, the poor, interpreted broadly. Pupils with learning difficulties and behaviour problems, those who are non-conforming, critical or dissenting, all have an important part to play in a Catholic school. If a Catholic school is to be true to its Gospel roots, such pupils should experience acceptance and affirmation as persons

with an inalienable dignity. Their uniqueness should be cherished, their talents nurtured, their questions taken seriously, their capacity for redemption never lost sight of, nor their spirits crushed. This does not mean that bad behaviour is condoned, explained away, ignored or downplayed; nor does it mean that the school should not strive for worldly success in terms of examination passes, sporting results, entry of pupils into higher education or into a variety of vocations. But it does imply that the school should seek to treat these aims as subordinate to other goals, ones which relate more directly to the spread of the Gospel, acceptance of its message, and furtherance of the Kingdom of God.[43]

It follows from a Christian perspective on life that "a person's significance is not determined by the value of what he or she contributes to other people's experiences....The fundamental worth of each human being lies neither in what a person achieves nor in what a person makes possible for others to achieve, but in God's love for that person."[44] Although this is easier to recognise in the context of the home, it applies also in the context of school. The unconditional acceptance and love experienced by children at home will provide a powerful foundation, indeed it is a prerequisite for later recognition of God's love for us.[45] Such inclusiveness forms the human soil in which the Gospel message can be sown.

Those on the margins of acceptability, the semi-committed, the half-believers, the occasional participants, the lapsed or 'resting' church members - all can be only too easily excluded from admission into church schools. There is a danger here of a contradiction between values which are espoused and those which are upheld in practice. Kenneth Wilson has recently pointed out that whereas church schools were originally set up in the nineteenth century to provide educational opportunities for the poor (who were excluded by the prevailing system, one which catered only for the

rich), now they tend to cater principally for those who could not be considered poor at all.[46]

Wilson is particularly critical of church school admission policies which require evidence of religious commitment. "Those who are able to satisfy this criterion tend to be those who would be educationally rich anyway - religion having become a minority middle class pastime."[47] The desire in church schools to ensure that they contain a high proportion of pupils who come from religiously committed families undermines, for Wilson, their gospel imperative of service and has several other damaging side-effects:

> [First] it would deprive many children of the everyday contacts with those of different faiths and cultures which could help prepare them for adult life in a multi-faith community. [Second] excluding non- Christian children from one of the borough's better schools [gives] a disquieting message about the church's attitude to equal opportunities. [Third] it indirectly [tells] the other faith communities that they should make their own arrangements for the education of their children - suggesting a future of segregation with possibly unthinkable consequences.[48]

These are important criticisms of church school admission policies, which should not operate in a way that compounds anyone's disadvantage. But while they should cause governors of church schools to review very carefully the implications of their admission policies, and while the application of religious criteria is notoriously difficult to manage with consistency and justice, this does not mean that there is no place for such criteria. A crucial barrier to admittance in Catholic schools would relate to whatever made Catholic education very difficult to carry out, whatever was incompatible with its central tenets, purpose, and atmosphere, although each of these stipulations is vulnerable to the criticism that such judgements are merely subjective

and may depend too much upon the willingness of a school to be inclusive in the range of senses indicated earlier and to persevere in the face of difficulties. While a school may decide (with regret) that it could no longer cope with certain kinds of misbehaviour, in the face of activities which undermined its purpose as a Catholic school, this might better be decided *after* it had tried and failed, not before.[49]

I am prescinding from this argument the special case of those pupils who have severe learning, physical or emotional difficulties and for whom the school is inadequately equipped to provide a suitable education. In such cases the cost of additional provision might be prohibitive. However, the burden of proof in this case would rest with the school. The assumption must be in favour of inclusiveness, rather than the other way about. It is only too easy to seek to justify non-acceptance of pupils on spurious grounds which relate more closely to the perceived reputation and desired results of the school than to its *raison d'etre*.

However, if it *is* accepted that there is a legitimate place for separate church schools,[50] it is not illogical to seek to preserve their special character by ensuring that they contain a proportion of Catholic pupils which is sufficiently high to constitute a critical mass. It will be even more important to ensure that there is a significant proportion of staff who are committed to a Catholic approach to education, if the distinctiveness of such schools is to be maintained.[51]

Part of what is meant by the inclusiveness of Catholic schools is the role they *share with* other agencies within the community. Education in general, and Catholic education in particular, is not the exclusive preserve of schools.[52] It is a collective endeavour which is shared with parents, the parish, the wider church community (deanery, diocesan, national and even international - many religious orders which play

an important role in Catholic education have an international membership), Christian associations, youth clubs and charitable organisations.

Government educational policy throughout much of the 1990s encouraged schools to 'opt out' from their Local Education Authority and to receive funding directly from national government. In the case of Catholic schools who adopted the more independent Grant Maintained status this decision often distanced them from the diocesan system of schools, even when it did not flout diocesan policy. Any attempt to make schools operate as independent 'islands' undermines cooperation, community and co-responsibility for the common good. It encourages the use of education as a positional good for the benefit of elites, rather than as transformational of personal experience and as constitutive of the good life to be shared in common. It would be unfortunate if, after only recently shedding hierarchical features which were reinforced by pre-Vatican II models of church - now complemented by alternative models[53] - Catholic schools were to become less democratic internally and less accountable to their local communities - through an increase in internal, self-management, chief executive-style authority and a decrease in the influence of intermediate institutions. Despite counter-currents, the Catholic church is seeking ways to be a more participative community, with greater power-sharing, especially with the laity[54] It would be difficult now to reverse the trend towards greater integration between Catholicism and democratic modes of decision making and working.[55]

5.1.6 Inclusiveness as an educational virtue

In seeking to be sensitive to the different nuances of the word 'inclusive' I have so far referred to a developing understanding of the implications for Catholic schools of the

Christian Gospel. In order to deepen my exploration of these implications, I now turn to those dimensions of inclusiveness which should be reflected in the educational relationships prevailing in schools. One of the dilemmas facing Catholic schools is when and how they should respond to the need, in an increasingly pluralist society, to impart to pupils knowledge about people of other faiths or, indeed, knowledge about the world-view of those who reject any religious faith and whose perspective is guided or framed by some form of humanism. It is clear that such knowledge *should* be promoted, first, in the interests of social harmony and mutual understanding, second, in order to address the spiritual needs of pupils who are not Catholics and third, to enhance, through the opportunity afforded by comparison, the critical self-awareness of all pupils. A difficulty for some people might be how to relate an understanding of other life stances to an appreciation of and commitment to Catholicism itself, for the Catholic school would seem to be simultaneously both advocating a particular view of life (as I outlined in chapter four), giving it a privileged position in the life of the school, and calling it into question by the degree of its openness to and respectful treatment of other perspectives. This problem is considerably alleviated in principle, I believe, through my recasting of a Catholic philosophy of education by focusing on the intimate *relationship* between distinctiveness and inclusiveness.

If it were to be argued that there is within Catholicism itself an ecumenical imperative,[56] agreement has been reached neither as to the timing nor as to the degree at which such knowledge of the positions of others should be imparted. Deciding these matters is not merely a matter of pedagogical prudence, resting on empirical findings about notions of psychological 'readiness' or of conceptual development. The relative weight to be attached to the differing roles of Catholic schools in fostering identity-formation and in promoting the capacity for dialogue and mutual understanding between people of different faiths and cultures is still open to

debate. If it is true, as Sandsmark says, that the challenge for schools is to find the right balance,[57] this will depend, in part at least, on what are perceived to be the constitutive elements of a Catholic view of human nature, development and destiny (see chapter four) and the key features of a Catholic education (see chapter three). It will also depend upon the kind of theology of religions which is held, however implicitly, by the teacher, as well as on local circumstances.[58]

The belief, represented, for example, by John Stuart Mill in his *On Liberty* more than a century ago, that we *cannot* understand our own point of view properly until we have considered other points of view, for without such understanding we have no grounds for preferring our own, is in fact even older.[59] In 1644 John Milton argued in parliament against censorship of printing :

> what wisdom can there be to choose, what continence to forbear without the knowledge of evil?...I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat...[T]hat which purifies us is trial, and trial is by what is contrary.[60]

More recently, Larry May has shown the benefits of being exposed to a plurality of views which challenge us to reflect critically upon our own beliefs and which open up the possibility of better understanding the perspectives of others.[61] The early fathers of the church debated hotly the merits and dangers of engaging with sources beyond their faith. If openness to other points of view has not always been a leading virtue among Catholics, such openness indicates no lack of commitment to Catholicism.

A rather different approach to stressing the importance of inclusiveness is to show that it is at the very heart of the act of teaching. Martin Buber speaks of education as having an ascetic character, where the teacher seeks to separate herself from the

instinct to dominate and to experience the person 'on the other side' of the teaching relationship, the pupil.[62] He says that "inclusiveness is the complete realization of...the partner;" but this is not merely a matter of empathy; it is something more full-bodied than that.[63]

Buber depicts an educational relationship which is based on dialogue. In this relationship there is an awareness of the other's legitimacy, and the act of inclusion (by the teacher, of the pupil) is not merely regulative (as an act of moral restraint or self-discipline on the part of the teacher) but is also constitutive of the teacher-pupil relationship. There has to be a 'reaching over' by the teacher. "Only when he catches himself 'from over there', and feels how it [the child's individuality] affects one, how it affects this other human being, does he recognize the real limit of the situation."[64] But the experience of inclusion is one-sided in that the teacher "experiences the pupil's being educated, but the pupil cannot experience the educating of the educator. The educator stands at both ends of the common situation."[65]

For Buber then, teaching involves inclusion in so far it entails an effort to avoid the temptation to dominate another, and in so far as the teacher seeks to enter into the pupil's perspective and thereby to identify with his or her needs. Dialogue will be the hall-mark of the encounter, but the type of inclusion possible in teaching can only be one-sided, in that the dialogue partners are unequal in status and role; for only in friendship can we find a full experience of mutuality and reciprocity.

Two recent writers have commented helpfully on aspects of inclusiveness, developing Buber's insights further. The first, from the field of spirituality, is Henri Nouwen who, describing the type of inclusiveness (which he calls 'hospitality'[66]) to be exercised by teachers within the classroom, says that they should create a free and

friendly space, which will allow students to grow and reveal to them that they have something to offer as well as to receive.[67] "We will never believe that we have anything to give unless there is someone who is able to receive...[Students need] teachers who can detach themselves from their need to impress and control, and who can allow themselves to be receptive."[68] Nouwen invites teachers to think of their students as guests in their classrooms, guests who need affirmation, encouragement and support, but also a degree of unambiguous confrontation and challenging witness from the teacher. "Receptivity without confrontation leads to a bland neutrality that serves nobody. Confrontation without receptivity leads to an oppressive aggression which hurts everybody."[69] Nouwen's emphasis on 'hospitality' as an aspect of the teacher's role implies neither paternalism nor any failure to recognize the importance of encouraging student 'ownership' of their classrooms; although it does suggest that the primary responsibility for developing this rests with the teacher, especially with younger students and in the context of compulsory schooling.

I take it that the kind of inclusiveness being spoken of here by Nouwen is one which invites learners in classrooms to share their experiences, insights, and questions, accepting such contributions as gifts to be welcomed, respected and valued, but which also goes on to offer an encounter, through the teacher, with the insights and values of another world, a world that transcends what is currently envisaged by the pupils. This kind of inclusiveness involves openness and receptivity on the part of the teacher, but this should be a discerning receptivity, displaying no abdication of responsibility.[70] If the teacher is to reach out to pupils, starting from where they are, if she is to 'embrace' their needs, to accept their concerns and perceptions, nevertheless she is not to leave them at this point but instead to encourage them to 'travel' further. In the context of a Catholic school a particular sense of the direction of the travel, its goal and the pitfalls and helps along the journey, will be given normative status.

The second writer whose work illuminates the importance of inclusiveness within the practice of teaching is Max van Manen. In a sense the whole of his book *The Tact of Teaching* is about the building blocks of inclusiveness.[71] He asks the teacher to reflect on children's lives and he points out that pupils need security so that they can take risks and they need support so that they can become independent. They also need direction from us if they are to find their own direction in life. Tact means for van Manen the practice of being oriented towards others and in teaching to be tactful is to 'touch' someone. This tact will manifest itself as holding back (compare Buber's point, above, about resisting the temptation to dominate) and it will be manifested as openness to the child's experience and as attunement to his/her subjectivity. During the subtle influence exerted by the teacher on the pupil the child's space will be preserved, what is vulnerable in him or her will be protected and what is good will be strengthened, yet at the same time personal growth and learning will be sponsored. All this will be achieved through the mediation of speech, silence, the eyes, gesture, atmosphere and example. Such tact, however gentle, will still leave a mark on the child; the teacher should seek to make a difference.

These insights from van Manen, together with those from Nouwen, deepen our understanding of the nature of inclusiveness which is described by Buber as being at the heart of the educational relationship Such inclusiveness should be especially evident in the language used by teachers:[they] "should avoid words and language patterns that disvalue or degrade; that shame or demean; that are chauvinistic, oppressive or exclusive;...that are mechanistic, controlling or manipulative."[72] Two further comments are apposite here. First, the kinds of qualities indicated by these three writers as constituting pedagogical inclusiveness are not the monopoly of teachers working in Catholic schools, for they would be displayed by teachers of a

wide range of persuasions, religious and non-religious alike. There may, however, be additional motivational reasons for Christian teachers to embrace these inclusive qualities in their pedagogy: the belief that each pupil has a divine origin and an eternal destiny, that each pupil is made in the image and likeness of God, that in responding to his or her needs one is encountering Christ, and that, by opening oneself to her or his 'otherness', gifts and insights, one's appreciation of God's ways is likely to be enriched.

Second, a key element of the tact to be deployed in the context of a Catholic school is the response of teachers to pupils who come from families where either no religion is practised or where there is a commitment to a faith other than Catholicism. An inclusive response in this context should display the same human and moral sensitivity which Buber, Nouwen and van Manen have reminded us is a feature of all good teaching. The teacher will avoid "offensive or stigmatising comments about non-believers"[73] or about people whose beliefs differ from those which the school is specifically mandated to represent. Furthermore, in situations where there is an integration between religious material and other subjects, this will be carried out "in a manner which avoids proselytism and indoctrination."[74]

This point is of particular importance in the context of a Catholic school since I have already shown, in chapter three, how the integration of faith, culture and life is to be striven for as a key feature of Catholic education. The integration of faith, experience, attitudes and lifestyle to be aimed for in the classroom must display the kind of openness indicated over the last few paragraphs. There should be no undue pressure on pupils to reach 'appropriate' conclusions in that process of integration, nor any premature closure of discussion which might imply that there is not still more which could be explored.

Kevin Williams mentions two issues which arise in the context of a religious school seeking to provide an integrated approach to the curriculum, that is, where religion is treated as an integrating principle and where religion is reinforced through the teaching of other subjects.[75] The first issue relates to how we envisage religion might exercise an integrating role within the curriculum. The second issue relates to how we identify the respective rights of parents, pupils, the school and the community, and the tensions between these rights.

The two questions, although distinct, are connected, for the more religion is integrated into other curriculum subjects, the less possible it is either to withdraw from indirect religious education or to resist its message. It could also be claimed that too successful an integration of religion into the rest of the curriculum might prevent pupils from gaining a suitable degree of detachment, a vantage point from which to think critically about the religious principles put before them and it could weaken the autonomy of the disciplines which we have seen (in chapter three) is frequently upheld in the central guiding documents on Catholic education.[76]

Williams brings out clearly that there is some tension between the attempt to use religion as an integrating principle in the curriculum and the respective rights of pupils, parents and others. Parents have rights to bring up their children according to their own conception of the good. An over-dominant religion holding sway throughout the curriculum puts this right in jeopardy for some parents, even as it implements the wishes of others by demonstrating the all-pervasive relevance of religion.[77] There will also be implications for staff, if religion is acting as an integrating force, since such an integration cannot happen without the whole of the staff contributing in a

coherent way towards a common endeavour, "in the light of an agreed educational and Christian vision."[78]

If we accept the features of inclusiveness outlined already in this chapter, an over-dominant religion as integrating principle of the curriculum will run the risk of failing to show the tact asked for by van Manen, the refusal to submit to the temptation to dominate Buber warned of, and it will undermine the hospitality required of teachers by Nouwen. However, an insufficiently strong emphasis on the integrating role of religion in the teaching and life of a Catholic school will lead to an erosion of that distinctiveness which is the *raison d'etre* of its existence *as* a separate school. A careful balance has to be struck, one which promotes the centrality and potentially integrative force of religion in education, while at the same time exercising constraint and sensitivity with regard to its limits and potentially damaging side-effects.

If the preceding analysis is valid, Catholic schools should exhibit several features of inclusiveness. Firstly, the educational needs of pupils who are not Catholics but who find themselves, for a variety of reasons, in Catholic schools will be met satisfactorily. Secondly, members of staff who are not Catholics will be able to contribute both positively and with integrity in such schools. Thirdly, there will be sustained dialogue with external perspectives. Fourthly, the plurality of views within Catholicism itself will be given room for expression.[79] Fifthly, a spirit of tolerance of and respect for people with differing views will be fostered. Sixthly, there will be a promotion, wherever feasible, of the capacity to enter into cooperation, joint action and ecumenical endeavour with people of a variety of stances (ones that are not inimical to the school's values). Seventhly, the critical faculties of pupils will not be neglected or suppressed in an attempt to enforce orthodoxy, but instead they will be nurtured and

strengthened by an open, sympathetic yet rigorous treatment of doubts, difficulties and objections which might be raised either by believers or by unbelievers.

5.2.1 Exclusiveness on educational grounds

I have touched upon many dimensions of inclusiveness, including those which stem from a religious perspective on life and from the Gospel imperative, those which relate to our use of language, those which arise from the practice of differentiation and in the course of educationally felicitous teacher-pupil relationships. Some of these aspects of inclusiveness are not only in harmony with distinctively Catholic principles; they are required by them. Other aspects of inclusiveness are accepted as part of a set of liberal principles that do not depend upon Catholic beliefs, but which do not contradict them either.

This situation also applies to practices which should be *excluded* from Catholic schools: some of these would be excluded in any school which rests upon liberal principles; others would be excluded because they undermine a Catholic worldview. It will not always be easy to distinguish clearly the grounds on which some practices are to be excluded, for example whether or not these reasons depend on the adoption of religious doctrines; this will often stem from a combination of reasons, some primarily faith-based, while others are primarily based on more general principles of rationality, liberty and equality.

What sort of thing might be excluded? Indoctrination will be one of these excluded practices, on the grounds that it offends against some of the features of inclusiveness integral to good teaching which I referred to in 5.1.6, for example, tact, mutuality and reciprocity, an atmosphere of freedom for pupils and a fostering of their critical

faculties. Similarly, bullying, humiliation and practices which demean dignity or diminish self-esteem should be excluded from any educational setting. If we are to proclaim and to protect the value of each individual and his/her culture, any form of racism should also be ruled out.[80]

An overbearing role for the school as institution in relation to the individuals, both pupils and staff, who attend it, will also be excluded as incompatible with the purposes of liberal education. If healthy growth is to be fostered, there is a need to avoid both under- and over-protection. There is always a danger that, for the sake of preserving the purity of the gospel of salvation from possible contamination, and in order to protect the faithful from alternative and confusing messages, the church may seek to regulate variety too zealously.[81] An excess of control works against the creation of an ethical environment, for it reduces room for initiative or responsibility, for the development of a sense of agency and the opportunity to learn from mistakes.[82] Before the Second Vatican Council, limits to variety were intended to promote obedience and conformity. After it, an acceptance of the need to demonstrate that inclusiveness which is at the heart of the Christian gospel meant attention should be paid to differences among people, as well as to what they have in common.

In the context of a church school, where the transmission of a 'thick' tradition is part of its *raison d'etre* or mission, undue weight given to the institution sometimes shows itself in too heavy an emphasis given to the past over the present. I shall explore this defect further in the context of a discussion of living tradition.[83] Such a concern to protect the individual from undue institutional pressure does not necessarily entail an individual*ism* which neglects community; rather it seeks to allow for the confident development, measured growth and disciplined expression of individuality, where there is room for the pupils' own experience and perceptions to be taken seriously and

for the teachers' particular 'pedagogical signature'[84] to be written into the 'script' or drama of school affairs.

There would be several other candidates for exclusion. Some forms of competition - both between and within schools - would offend against both a liberal and a Catholic spirit, since they might lead to inadequate protection for the unsuccessful, especially those who are disadvantaged, and overconcern for public image or for the trappings of success. Within the curriculum an excessive emphasis on academic programmes of study or on vocational preparation would be inappropriate, since they could lead to an imbalanced education or to a reduction in opportunities. There should be no denial to pupils of the chance to encounter and reflect upon alternative (accurately and fairly represented) worldviews.

This open treatment of a variety of worldviews would stem partly from recognition of the contested nature of all 'thick' descriptions in our pluralist society and partly out of a desire to do justice to those whose views differ in significant ways from those promulgated by the school. It would rely, too, on the expectation that such open treatment would contribute positively to the securing of better understanding and the establishment of more harmonious relations between different groups in society.

If pupils are to develop a worldview of their own, then a consideration of how other worldviews are both similar to and also different from theirs should aid them in reaching a deeper understanding of its characteristics, grounding and implications. Such serious consideration of alternative worldviews does not imply that teachers should adopt a neutral stance towards any and every ideology, for, as I have already suggested, some stances will be ruled out as undermining of human flourishing, or as

antithetical to the educational endeavour. So long as viewpoints are described fairly and accurately, their shortcomings should be pointed out, as well as their strengths.

Some emphases in society are likely to be subjected to criticism in the context of a Catholic school, even if this occurs only at the level of staff discussion about how to respond to external pressures. Two examples here would be the use of technical rationality and the desire for self-fulfilment.[85] Each of these has a place but both can mislead us into thinking that we have understood a situation adequately or that we have adopted an appropriate strategy, and both can slip easily into activities which do less than justice to the complexities of human nature, motivation, learning and achievement. Technical rationality, if adopted uncritically, can lead to an overemphasis on managerialism, thereby falling short of key elements of leadership, the questioning of ends, as well as means, the exploration of values, the importance of vision and the exercise of practical judgement.[86] The stress on self-fulfilment, on the other hand, opens up the way to individualism, fails to count the cost of commitment, neglects the needs of community, relies too readily on therapy for readjustment and downplays the need for continuing conversion.

5.2.2 Compatibility and tension between Catholic and liberal principles

Catholics have incorporated into their social teaching many principles held dear within liberalism, interpreted broadly.[87] These would include an increased respect for the rights of minorities and of individual conscience. For the continued existence of their separate schools in England and Wales Catholics depend upon a social and political context where it is accepted that minorities have the right to protect and to promote their own way of life so long as this does not threaten the way of life of the majority. Schools which do not promote rationality, which insist on indoctrination, which do

not accept equal opportunities as of central importance, which threaten harmony within the community or which fail to provide for their pupils at least a minimum level of competence in a fairly prescribed national curriculum, receive neither the approval nor the support of the wider community. Unless they are prepared to stay in line on these issues, permission to continue will be denied to them, no matter how they are funded.

Immediately it will be clear that there is some tension between the attempt to hold together the distinctiveness of Catholic education with an openness to the liberal principles mentioned above. This tension would arise even if it were not the case that Catholic schools contain large numbers of pupils and staff who are not Catholics. The fact that they are so populated adds to the practical difficulties and poses moral dilemmas which perplex policy makers. I will explore this tension in more detail.

It arises partly from the difficulties of combining principles which emerge from radically different conceptual backgrounds. An example of this is the notion of human rights. In his analysis of the (1963) papal encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, John Langan draws out three subtle differences between a Catholic and a liberal understanding of human rights.[88] First, for Catholics, these rights do not exist prior to the duties to which they are correlative. One cannot exercise freedoms without acknowledging a parallel range of obligations. In liberalism obligations often receive a much lower profile than rights. Second, when rights are formulated, the goals toward which they are to be directed must be morally acceptable; the rightness of the use to which they are put is relevant to considerations of the validity of the rights themselves. The rights must be exercised within moral limits and for the sake of the common good, rather than as an act of self-expression. Third, much greater emphasis is given within a Catholic perspective to the role of family and church as safeguards of both dignity and

freedom in the social order and as vital agencies which have group rights themselves. Taken together, these points tend to reduce the usually overriding, even if not absolute, status often attributed to rights by liberals.

One difficulty for Catholic educators in a liberal society is that society has become accustomed to the advocacy of a 'thin' rather than a 'thick' description of what constitutes the 'good' to be pursued and to be protected, in the public sphere at least. By a 'thick' description of the good I mean one with the following six general features. First, its several interlocking parts jointly constitute a system (rather than a loose collection of disconnected elements). Second, it will be far-reaching in its scope and explanatory power. Third, it will have been highly developed over a substantial period of time. Fourth, it will be embedded in a particular community. Fifth, it is transmitted in the context of traditions, narratives and prescribed actions. Sixth, it possesses normative status for its adherents.[89] In contrast, a 'thin' conception of the good relies on procedural principles which command a very wide level of acceptance within society, partly because they are envisaged as not being founded on any one particular, more substantive view of life. These principles need not necessarily be so interrelated that they constitute any coherent system. They do not attempt to articulate a philosophy of the good which covers all major dimensions of life, concentrating on those aspects required for peaceful cooperation. The 'thin' conception of the good is also held to be normative, although more for its instrumental than for its intrinsic value.

The justification for relying on a 'thin' view of the good comes partly from a supposed reduction in the level of consensus within society as to which values should receive public support, in terms of law, taxation and social approval.[90] It depends also on a heightened awareness of the presence within our society (largely through immigration

since the end of the Second World War) of people with a plurality of worldviews and cultures that differ significantly from both Christianity and from western political liberalism.

In public and in our legislation we have adjusted to a situation where a 'thin' understanding of the 'good life' prevails and those who hold a 'thick' understanding are permitted to express this in private, in their homes, churches, specific associations, and, for some, with certain limitations, in their schools. Catholic schools operate out of a 'thick' framework, while being part of a society which restricts itself to operating out of a 'thin' framework. Not all parents, pupils and staff associated with Catholic schools accept the 'thick' framework. Catholics who do accept this framework are not all agreed as to the attitude they should take towards people who adopt policies which appear to arise from the 'thin' framework.

5.2.3 Wine, water and acid: exclusiveness as protective of integrity

Another aspect of the tension caused by the combination of principles from conceptually different family backgrounds can be brought out by introducing the metaphors of wine, water and acid. It might be said, from a faith perspective, that the combination of elements which make up a distinctively Catholic reading of the human condition and an education appropriate to that condition blend together in such a way as to be available for us as 'wine': fortifying, nourishing, palatable and capable of lifting our spirits. The metaphor of wine can, of course, be double-edged; for wine can also stultify our thinking, divert us from reality, slow down our reactions and damage us internally. However, for the purposes of this comparison, let wine represent the 'proper article', a liquid which is ideal for our present condition and which at the same time provides a foretaste of heaven, our future destination.

When mixed with some elements, the effects are to 'water down' the distinctively Catholic wine on offer. This 'watering down' could be envisaged as coming about in at least two ways: first, through the sheer presence in schools of significant numbers of pupils, parents and staff who are themselves not committed to Catholic education;[91] second, by accommodating principles which, although not themselves directly hostile to Catholicism, stem originally from a liberal society which seeks to be neutral as between religions and agnostic as to what constitutes the 'good' life. Among these might be included freedom of conscience and of speech, equality of opportunity, toleration of difference, the priority given to (a particular interpretation of) both rationality and autonomy, the rejection of indoctrination and a stance in the face of pluralism which seems to be accepting of relativism.[92]

Similarly, if the school has adopted, to any significant degree, the drive to succeed in league tables and to survive in a market-oriented approach to education, and if it so emphasises the importance of customer satisfaction (whether these customers are seen as the pupils or the parents) and the meeting of individual preferences, then, to some degree, less time and energy might be devoted to the promotion of central Catholic messages about education. In such circumstances it will sometimes be difficult to avoid watering down the priorities and practices that are central to Catholic education.

It is not that these possible additional elements are all inimical to Catholic education, (although some are), or that they are all equally damaging (for some are more likely than others to undermine the Catholic ethos of a school). A school which tried to combine the key concepts in Catholic education with some interpretations of autonomy, choice, rationality, and the contested nature of the good or with the market oriented approach to education could find itself in danger of watering down its

message, dissipating its energies, confusing the members of its community and preventing the attainment of its main goals.

This is partly because there is a limit to the number of principles that can be taken on board as overriding and all-pervasive. Such principles need constant clarification, dedicated exemplification, nurture and celebration, if they are to permeate every aspect of school life. The greater the diversity of 'messages' sent to pupils, staff and parents through the many aspects of the workings of a school, the less powerfully the central 'message' will appear to be communicated. Any attempt to pursue several different goals in a school makes it less likely that some of them will be properly heard, let alone receive strong commitment.

This watering down effect also partly comes about because there is some tension, if not direct contradiction, between some of the possible additional features which Catholic schools may be tempted to adopt. For example, if the drive to be top of local or national league tables of examination results is pursued too vigorously, this may conflict with alternative priorities in Catholic schools, such as salvation of souls or caring for the poor. Some kinds of punishment of wrongdoing and some forms of condemnation of failure may conflict with the imperative to display Gospel values and the spirit of forgiveness. Some expressions of school promotion in the 'market-place' may undermine the notion of the common good by damaging other schools or by preventing internal critical voices from being heard. This is not to say that caring and effectiveness cannot be found together, nor is it to imply that success necessarily implies exploitation. But there has to be coherence and compatibility among school values. The kinds of success which are to be striven for, the means used to achieve school aims, the allocation of resources to priorities, all need to be guided, ordered and brought into harmony by reference to core principles which articulate the mission

of the school. Perhaps greater clarity about these core principles will assist leaders in the task of discerning when the adoption of additional priorities might weaken the school's mission.

If some combinations lead to watering down the 'wine' of Catholic education, others have a much more serious effect: the 'liquid' which is left is more like acid than either water or wine. If principles are adopted which are incompatible with the Catholic 'core' themes, they may end up being corrosive of the mission of the school. Vigilance with regard to the principles which are espoused within a school is always necessary. A critical awareness of their roots, implications and effects is needed, whether they are expressed in government policies, other political or social priorities or in the ideologies which contest for allegiance in our culture. Somewhere a line has to be drawn: such and such a principle is incompatible with a Catholic view of education; while it can be discussed, it cannot be *promoted* in a Catholic school; those who seek to do so will be subject to constraint or even to sanctions, depending on the degree to which (and the deliberateness with which) they seek to undermine the ethos of the school. In a community which aims to be distinctive, the advocacy of some kinds of principles or priorities is ruled out as incompatible with the *raison d'etre* or mission of that community. For example, an atomistic individualism, methodological atheism, a distorted interpretation of autonomy and rationality lacking guidance from grace or conversion, subjectivism and relativism in morality, all of which were treated in chapter three, are incompatible with the mission of Catholic schools. This is true also of excessive accommodation to political pressures for a market-led, competitive approach to education, where education is dominated by economic priorities, and also of some of the assumptions implicit in 'managerialism', briefly critiqued in chapter one.

5.2.4 Dangers of exclusiveness

To some extent, then, the claim to distinctiveness necessarily involves a degree of exclusiveness. If it is to avoid slipping into elitism, such exclusiveness needs constant vigilance; it should be kept to a minimum and conducted with humility. If too 'strong' a conception of distinctiveness is operative, pupils and staff who do not share this view could be seen as a potential threat. There are three different types of criticism which can be envisaged if exclusiveness is perceived to be a *dominant* feature of Catholic education.

The first of these could arise from within a certain understanding of Catholic tradition itself. It might be put like this. Inadequate room is left in the 'strong' model for proper attention to be given to either the autonomy of the disciplines or to the synthesis between faith, culture and life. Behind this accusation might lie the belief that the model of orthodoxy at work is too closed, too certain, too dominant and too prescriptive to allow room for the development of doctrine or growth in moral understanding. What is 'outside' the bounds of acceptability is decided too soon and what is 'inside' is accepted too readily, with insufficient examination. Such a view of the tradition to be conveyed lacks openness to the notion that the Holy Spirit is still calling us more fully into truth; it assumes that we already possess everything that is needed, so that any adjustment made within the tradition to allow a closer cooperation with those 'outside the gates' would be interpreted as a retreat. In short, this response would be based on the assumption that tradition is *living* and that the 'strong' interpretation of the distinctiveness of a Catholic education is in fact restricted and that it constitutes a reduction of the fullness of Catholicism.[93]

The second type of criticism might also emerge from among supporters of Catholic education. It might be expressed in the following way. To uphold the 'strong' interpretation of Catholic education with full rigour in a context where the continued survival of Catholic schools depends in practice upon the presence and the contribution of both pupils and staff who are not Catholic would be a suicidal policy, one that would lead to the closure of many such schools, and therefore to a massive reduction in the availability of Catholic education for Catholic children, let alone any possibility of witnessing to Catholic education and values for other children. This criticism might be developed further by the claim that, with such a reduction in the number of Catholic schools, there would be far less room for the expression of parental choice in educational matters and fewer alternatives to offer in place of a monolithic state educational system, one that is based on a range of values which are either unsupportive of or in some cases inimical to Catholic principles, for example, with regard to perceptions of objective truth or values, or in matters relating to sexual behaviour, social welfare, or medical ethics.[94]

A third type of criticism has come from those outside the Catholic tradition. It relies on one or more of the following fears. First there is a fear that separate education for Catholics will allow indoctrination, and as a result will undermine children's rights.[95] Second, there is a fear that religious segregation, (sometimes associated with ethnic and class segregation) will lead to isolation and elitism and so damage social cohesion. Third, with increasing demands from other minority groups, for example the Muslim community, for separate schools, there is a fear that national educational policy will have to choose between the alternatives of allowing increasing fragmentation within the national culture by conceding a much higher number of separate schools with a distinctive ethos, or of perpetrating an injustice by refusal to extend rights currently held by Catholics, among others.

5.4 : Conclusion

In this chapter I have explored how the Catholic claim to offer a distinctive approach to education relates to its parallel claim that such an education must be inclusive if it is to be consistent with the key principles which provide a *raison d'etre* for separate Catholic schools. I have identified several features of inclusiveness and exclusiveness and considered their relevance for Catholic schools. In this analysis I have argued that many characteristics of inclusiveness are both intrinsic to and essential for Catholic education. I have also shown that, although many kinds of exclusiveness are incompatible with Catholic principles, some kinds of exclusiveness are necessarily entailed by the claim to be distinctive. Establishing the right balance, where distinctiveness is maintained in such a way that the maximum of inclusiveness is promoted and the minimum of exclusiveness is permitted, is a delicate and complex task. In the next chapter I examine the notion of 'living tradition' for the light it can cast on the project of combining distinctiveness with inclusiveness in a manner which avoids the dangers that can accompany such an association.

Notes and references for chapter five

[1]For an interesting treatment of inclusive and exclusive forms of secularism in schools, one which contrasts with my treatment of inclusive and exclusive forms of Catholic education, see Graham Haydon, 'Conceptions of the Secular in Society, Polity and Schools', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* vol. 28, no. 1, 1994, pp.65 - 75. For a treatment of the open and closed aspects of Catholic school culture, see also Kevin Williams, 'Religion, Culture and Schooling' in *From Ideal to Action,* edited by Matthew Feheney, Dublin, Veritas, 1998. Williams argues that one of the most distinctive features of a Catholic school should be its openness. He shows (p.50) that "a Christian school which is clear sighted about its *telos* does not have to be intolerant, ungenerous and illiberal in its culture."

[2]See Michael Barnes, *Religions in Conversation,* London, SPCK, 1989, p.180. : "It is only when I have someone prepared to listen to me that I learn how to speak. And only when I learn how to speak do I know what it is that I have to say. The conversation helps both partners to articulate their experience, to become not 'other' but truly self."

[3]Several conditions which are unfavourable to the flourishing of Catholic schools are listed in *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School,* from the Congregation for Catholic Education, London, CTS, 1988, para.104. "the educational goals are either not defined or are defined badly; those responsible for the school are not sufficiently trained; concern for academic achievement is excessive; relations between teachers and students are cold and impersonal; teachers are antagonistic toward one another; discipline is imposed from on high without any participation or cooperation from the students; relationships with families are formal or even strained, and families are not involved in helping to determine the educational goals; some within the school community are giving a negative witness; individuals are unwilling to work together for the common good; the school is isolated from the local Church; there is no interest in or concern for the problems of society; religious instruction is 'routine'."

[4]On inculturation, see chapter two, p.98 and its associated notes 15-17.

[5]See the two Catholic Education Service publications, *Partners in Mission* (a collection of talks by Bishops on issues affecting Catholic education), London, 1997 and *Principles, Practices and Concerns,* Manchester, 1996. Also see the two documents from the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *The Common Good in Education,* Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1997 and *The Common Good and the Catholic Church's Social Teaching,* Manchester, Gabriel Communications, 1996.

[6]J. Quicke, 'Differentiation : a contested concept', *Cambridge Journal of Education,* vol. 25, no. 2, 1995, p.214.

[7]*Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs*, Department for Education and Welsh Office, 1994; Circular 6/94: *The Organisation of Special Educational Provision*, Department for Education, 1994.

[8]See Robert Stradling and Lesley Saunders, *Differentiation in Action*, London, NFER/HMSO, 1991, and also National Council for Educational Technology, *Differentiation : A Practical Handbook of Classroom Strategies*, Coventry, NCET, 1993. Catholic Education Service, *Differentiation: A Catholic Response*, London, 1997.

[9]For an article which retrieves an Aristotelian interpretation of rhetoric and relates this the task of school leadership, see John Sullivan, 'Leading Values and Casting Shadows', *Pastoral Care in Education,* vol. 15, no. 3, September 1997, pp.8- 12. A thorough and penetrating commentary is offered in Eugene Garver, *Aristotle's Rhetoric: An Art of Character*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

[10]There is also a close connection between the notions of reception and inculturation. On inculturation, see chapter three, notes 16-18. For two important studies on 'reception', see Frederick Bliss, *Understanding Reception*, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1994, and Daniel Finucane, *Sensus Fidelium: The Uses of a Concept in the Post-Vatican II Era,* San Francisco, International Scholars Publications, 1996.

[11]My retrieval of Blondel on living tradition in chapter six develops this point further.

[12]On the potential oppressiveness of some forms of Catholic schooling, see the chapter by Peter Hastings in *The Contemporary Catholic School*, [*CCS*] edited by McLaughlin, O'Keeffe and O'Keefe, London, Falmer Press, 1996 and also the comment by Gerald Grace (in his essay 'The Future of the Catholic School: An English Perspective', in *From Ideal to Action*, edited by Matthew Feheney, Dublin, Veritas, 1998, p.201.) that "a 'strong' form of Catholic ethos may, in practice, be oppressive and alienating in religious formation and inhibiting to open and critical inquiry."

[13]Jim Gallagher, *CCS*, p.292.

[14]John Paul II, *Catechesi Tradendae*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1979, section 69, p.92. For the theme of respect for religious freedom in Catholic education, see also *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, para 6. *Cf.* the priority to be given to those who are either poor or far from the faith, a point made in *Gravissimum Educationis*, para 9 and re-emphasized in *The Catholic School*, para 58. *cf.* also *The Catholic School*, para 85: "In the certainty that the Spirit is at work in every person, the Catholic school offers itself to all,... acknowledging, preserving and promoting the spiritual and moral qualities, the social and cultural values, which characterise different civilizations".

[15]See *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994, paragraph 24, which recognizes "the adaptation of doctrinal presentations ...required by the differences of culture, age, spiritual maturity, and social and ecclesial condition among those to whom [the Catechism] is addressed." It goes on to quote from an earlier catechism: "Whoever teaches must become 'all things to all men' (1 Cor 9:22),

to win everyone to Christ....Teachers should not imagine that a single kind of soul has been entrusted to them, and that consequently it is lawful to teach and form equally all the faithful in true piety with one and the same method!"

[16]Especially forms one to four, seven and eight, as listed on pp.197-198 above.

[17]The inclusive approach to pupils should also display the educational virtues outlined in section 5.1.6.

[18]Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *Catholic Schools & Other Faiths*, London, Catholic Education Service, 1996.

[19]*Ibid.*, pp.4, 6.

[20]In particular, *Nostra Aetate*, on relations with other faiths, *Dignitatis Humanae*, on religious freedom and *Gaudium et Spes*, on positive acceptance of the modern world.

[21]Via the mediating principles outlined in the documents listed in note 5, above. The influence of both liberation and feminist theology has also contributed to pressure towards a greater inclusiveness on the part of the Catholic Church.

[22]This equal worth stems from the converging religious and pedagogical senses of being perceived as unique manifestations and objects of God's love and also as deserving to have their individual learning needs attended to.

[23]For example, anthropology, sociology, psychology and politics.

[24]See Owen O'Sullivan, *The Silent Schism: Renewal of Catholic Spirit and Structures*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1997, p.109, on the integration of the feminine for a greater completeness in the church and p.175, on the attitudes prerequisite for ecumenism: tolerance of diversity, a spirit of dialogue, respect for the person, recognition of the role of reception and working in *communio* (all drawn from Pope John Paul II's encyclical *Ut Unum Sint*, 1995). O'Sullivan makes a strong plea for the magisterium to encourage and to facilitate a much higher level of participation in decision-making in the life of the church. Without such widespread and active participation there can be no real reception of the church's teaching, only passivity, indifference or rejection. "How can an organization which effectively excludes over 99 per cent of its membership from participation in decision-making realistically be regarded as a paradigm for human relations?" (*ibid.*, pp.176, 188.)

[25]On the option for the poor, see Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *The Common Good and the Catholic Church's Social Teaching*, Manchester, Gabriel Communications, 1996, paragraphs 12-15. For a direct application of such teaching to education, see Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *The Common Good in Education*, Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1997. The priority to be given to the disadvantaged has been given official status as a core principle in Catholic education. See *Principles, Practices and Concerns*, p.3, and *Learning from OFSTED and Diocesan Inspections*, pp.20-21, both Catholic Education Service, 1996. On theology of religions and inter-faith relations see Michael Barnes, *Religions in Conversation*, London, SPCK, 1989 and *Christianity and other Religions*, edited by John Hick and Brian Hebblethwaite, Glasgow, Collins, 1980.

[26]For examples of feminist theology, see *Women's Voices: Essays in Contemporary Feminist Theology*, edited by Teresa Elwes, London, Marshall Pickering, 1992; *Feminist Theology : A Reader*, edited by Ann Loades, London, SPCK, 1990; and Elizabeth Johnson, *She Who Is*, New York, Crossroad, 1992.

[27]Charles Bailey, *Beyond the Present and Particular*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984, on the role of education to liberate pupils from their present horizons and interests.

[28]Harvey Siegel, 'What Price Inclusion?', *Teachers College Record*, vol. 97, no. 1, Fall 1995, pp.10, 25.

[29]*Ibid.*, p.25.

[30]"For some discourses, not everyone is qualified or competent to participate...For conversations to be maximally functional, or maximally interesting, informative, or communicative for their participants, some potential participants may well be best left out....For some conversations, exclusion is perfectly legitimate on the basis of (lack of) appropriate expertise." Siegel, *ibid.*, p.20.

[31]*Ibid.*, p.14.

[32]Jonathan Sacks, *The Persistence of Faith*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1991, p.106.

[33]Aidan Nichols, *Byzantine Gospel*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1993, pp.32, 39.

[34]Matthew 28.18. The Gospels as a whole show Jesus being inclusive of sinners, outcasts, women, people of other races, the unpopular, the sick.

[35]Michael Barnes, SJ, 'Catholic Schools in a World of Many Faiths,' in *CCS*, p.236.

[36]*Ibid.*

[37]Barnes, *Religions in Conversation*, pp.8, 35. See also M.P. Gallagher, *Clashing Symbols*, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1997, pp.104, 120-121, 123. Discernment and discrimination are needed in sifting for truth, as well as positive outreach in our searching. Such discrimination will occasionally require denunciation of whatever dehumanizes.

[38]See Barnes, *ibid.*, p.49. "Salvation is not the privilege of belonging to the group, but the gift of sharing in the divine activity."

[39]See Mike Golby, (unpublished) 'Communitarianism and Education' in Papers of Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1996, p.152. These communities of memory are also for Golby "constitutive" communities, "those associations which we ourselves recognise as fundamental to our self description." Golby has some interesting and challenging comments to make on the degree to which schools can be or fail to be communities, whether of local communities (of place), communities of memory or psychological communities.

[40]Thomas Ogletree, quoted by Lucien Richard in Jeff Astley, Leslie Francis and Colin Crowder (eds), *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1996, p.159.

[41]Lash, *op.cit.*, pp.258-9. Such an all-embracing approach will be guided, for Lash, by what he calls the 'identity-sustaining rules of Christian discourse and behaviour'. See pp.259, 271, 272.

[42]See *The Ebbing Tide,* pp.227-8.

[43]For descriptions of what is possible in these respects, see Pat Carney, 'Black Pride on Moss Side', *The Tablet,* 11th October, 1997, p.1294; and *Conversations in Excellence,* edited by Joseph O'Keefe and Regina Haney, Boston and New York, Boston College/National Catholic Educational Association, 1998.

[44]David Pailin, *A Gentle Touch,* (London, SPCK, 1992), pp.13, 95.

[45]See John Bradford, *Caring for the Whole Child,* London, The Children's Society, 1995, p.37. In the case of a child, "his family do not love him because they think him beautiful, or because he is intelligent or talented, or because he has a nice nature... They love him for no better reason than that he is theirs. [This is a] love which he does not have to deserve,and which he can therefore count on."

[46]Kenneth Wilson, *Education,* 23 February 1996, p.12.

[47]*Ibid.*

[48]*Ibid.*

[49]Other issues have a bearing on admissions policies, for example, an argument along the lines that it is only just to give priority in allocating places to people who have contributed financially to Catholic schools.

[50]I develop a case for this in chapter seven.

[51]See Appendix 1. It is not part of my argument that to suggest that the current model of Catholic school is the only one that is valid.

[52]Neil Postman suggests that schools should limit how much should be included as part of their work, if excessive expectation and teacher overload is to be avoided, if schools are to keep clearly in focus their main priorities, and if there is to be no intrusion on the prerogatives of others. Postman, *Teaching as a Conserving Activity,* New York, Dell Publishing, 1979, chapter VI.

[53]Avery Dulles, *Models of Church,* (Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1974) has provided one of the most influential summaries of a changing ecclesiology. See Appendix 2 for a brief summary of this contribution.

[54]See Leonard Doohan, *The Lay-Centered Church,* Minneapolis, Winston Press, 1984, Edmund Hill, *Ministry and Authority in the Catholic Church,* London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1988 and Terence Nichols, *That All May Be One : Hierarchy and Participation in the Church,* Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 1997, for three examples of a less hierarchical emphasis in post Vatican II ecclesiology.

[55]Apart from Grasso et al (eds) *op. cit.*, see also *Catholicism and Liberalism,* edited by Bruce Douglass and David Hollenbach, Cambridge University Press, 1994. *The Sign We Give* a report on collaborative ministry produced for the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1995, argues (p.20) for inclusiveness to be treated as a central feature of Catholicism. The report relates

this inclusiveness to the quality of relationships within the church, which should be based on equality, mutuality and reciprocity, and where all are not only welcomed, but offered a part to play in the life of the church. (p.26) The model of collaborative leadership advocated within a seminary has a wider application, if inclusiveness is to be taken seriously, in the context of Catholic schools. It should display "openness to ideas, consultation of the whole community in appropriate matters, willingness to listen, commitment to building relationships, inclusion of people with varying gifts and experience within the seminary community." (*ibid.*, p.38) A community informed by church teaching should demonstrate an "awareness of voices that are unintentionally marginalized, or even missing altogether." (*ibid.*, p.31)

[56]See, for example, *Ut Unum Sint*, encyclical of Pope John Paul II, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1995; *Working for Unity*, by Dennis Rudd and Emmanuel Sullivan, Arundel and Brighton Diocese, 1993 and Priscilla Chadwick, (1994), *Schools of Reconciliation*, London, Cassell.

[57]Signe Sandsmark, 'Religion - Icing on the Educational Cake?', *Religious Education, Vol.* 90, No3/4, Summer/Fall 1995, p. 427.

[58]See Michael Barnes, *Religions in Conversation*, op.cit.

[59]John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, quoted by Tony Jackson, *Discipleship or Pilgrimage? The Educator's Quest for Philosophy*, State University of New York Press, 1995), p.143. : [even the absolute truth] "unless it is suffered to be and actually is, vigorously and earnestly contested, it will by most of those who receive it, be held in the manner of prejudice, with little comprehension or feeling of its rational grounds."

[60]John Milton, *Areopagitica & other tracts*, London, Dent, 1907, p.22. Cf. Christopher Dawson : *The Crisis of Western Education*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1961, p.113 :"until a man acquires some knowledge of another culture, he cannot be said to be educated, since his whole outlook is so conditioned by his own social environment that he does not realize its limitations. He is provincial in time, if not in place, and he almost inevitably tends to accept the standards and values of his own society as absolute."

[61]Larry May, *The Socially Responsive Self*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1996, pp.17, 18, 22, 41. Israel Scheffler endorses this view: "self-knowledge is a typical fruit of contrast with others, against which one's own distinctiveness is more sharply etched: this principle applies to groups as well as individuals." Scheffler, *In Praise of the Cognitive Emotions*, London, Routledge, 1991, p.109.

[62]Martin Buber, *Between Man and Man*, London, Fontana, 1974, p.123.

[63]*Ibid.*, p.124.

[64]*Ibid.*, p.128.

[65]*Ibid.* The teacher-pupil relation is a one-sided or one-way version of the I-Thou relation for Buber.

[66]A term I have already used in this chapter (p.207) - in the context of a double hermeneutics - to indicate an attitude of welcome for the strange and unfamiliar.

[67]Henri Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, London, Collins/Fount, 1980, p.81.

[68]*Ibid.*

[69]*Ibid.*, pp.82, 91, 92. *Cf.* Padraig Hogan's notion of 'the courtship of youthful sensibility', in *The Custody and Courtship of Experience*, Dublin, The Columba Press, 1995, especially pp. 151, 168, 169, 171, which emphasize the need to make learning hospitable to pupils' unique identity and promise, the interplay between the emergent abilities and sensibilities of pupils and the voices which address them through the teacher and the need to avoid proprietorial claims on pupils. See also 'Learning in Comfort: Developing an Ethos of Hospitality in Education', by Anthony Rud, in *The Educational Conversation*, edited by James Garrison and Anthony Rud, New York, State University of New York, Press, 1995.

[70]Cf. the comment by Parker Palmer, *To Know As We Are Known*, San Francisco, Harper and Row, 1983, p.104 : "The teacher, who knows the subject well, must introduce it to students in the way one would introduce a friend. The student must know why the teacher values the subject, how the subject has transformed the teacher's life. By the same token the teacher must value the students as potential friends, be vulnerable to the ways students may transform the teacher's relationship with the subject as well as be transformed."

[71]Max van Manen, *The Tact of Teaching : The Meaning of Pedagogical Thoughtfulness*, London, Ontario, The Althouse Press, 1993.

[72]Thomas Groome, *Educating for Life*, Allen, Texas, Thomas More Press, 1998, p.197. Groome unpacks further some of the features of inclusive teaching on pp.199-200.

[73]Kevin Williams, 'The Religious Dimension of Secular Learning : an Irish dilemma', *Panorama*, 1996, p.12.

[74]*Ibid.*

[75]*Ibid.*, p.2.

[76]It would also undermine the points raised by von Hügel, relating to 'our need of the non-religious dimensions' and 'friction', which I examined in chapter three.

[77]Williams points out elsewhere : "The obligation to accommodate minority groups must not be understood to qualify the right of denominational schools to preserve their distinctive ethos." 'Education and Human Diversity: the ethics of separate schooling revisited', Papers of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1997, p.133. This article has now been published in *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 46, No. 1, 1998, pp.26-39. It should be noted that Williams is referring, not to the kind of Catholic schools we have in England and Wales, where they constitute only a minority (about 10% of schools in total), but to the rather different context of Catholic schools in Ireland, where they are the common form of schooling.

[78]Dermot Lane, 'Catholic Education and the School : Some Theological Reflections', in *The Catholic School in Contemporary Society*, Dublin, Conference of Major Religious Superiors, 1991, p.92. A fully inclusive education will develop not only the

cognitive or academic competence of pupils, but also their affective, experiential, existential and vocational development.

[79]This relates to the tenth form of inclusiveness mentioned on p.[illegible] above. Examples of the plurality of views within Catholicism include the practice of contraception, the merits of intercommunion, the standing of the divorced in relation to reception of sacraments, the scope of church authority in relation to theological expression, the relative emphasis to be given to social justice or to spirituality in the life of the church, the respective weight to be given to local, national and to Roman decisions, for example, in episcopal appointments. Some of these impinge directly on schools and require sensitive handling.

[80]"Every form of social or cultural discrimination in fundamental personal rights on the grounds of sex, race, colour, social conditions, language or religion, must be curbed and eradicated as incompatible with God's design." quoted from Walsh and Davies' (1984) collection, *Proclaiming Justice and Peace: Documents from John XXIII to John Paul II*, London, Collins Liturgical Publications, by Leela Ramdeen, in *CCS*, p.206. cf *Colour and Spice*, Southwark Diocesan Board of Education, London, 1994; *Respect for All*, David Griffith and David Lankshear, London, The National Society, 1996; *Cultural Diversity in Catholic Schools*, Shane Martin, National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, DC, 1996.

[81]Desmond Ryan describes a series of 'variety-limiters' in the context of the English Catholic parish in the middle of the twentieth century. See his study, *The Catholic Parish*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1996, pp. 232-234. He suggests that "protecting its core structure" involved the church in "locking out those ...who got too close to the concerns of the world for the system controllers' comfort." (*ibid.*, p.233) Ryan also describes (*ibid*, pp.234-235) a set of 'variety amplifiers' which were put in place after the Second Vatican Council. The attitude had been one where "the system needed to make few concessions to local variety: souls were all the same, and saving souls in aggregate was the system's *raison d'etre.*" (*ibid.*, p.266) Cf Thiessen, E *Teaching for Commitment*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1993, pp.177-9 on the nature (and defects) of 'total institutions'.

[82]Leonardo Boff refers to 'institutional arthritis' and to the pathological nature of an excessively conservative Catholicism in *Church: Charism & Power*, London, SCM Press, 1985, p. 85.

[83]See chapter six.

[84]Elliott Eisner, *The Enlightened Eye*, New York, Macmillan, 1991.

[85]N. Brennan, 'Christian Education, Contestation and the Catholic School', p.10. in Conference of Major Religious Superiors (Ireland), *The Catholic School in Contemporary Society*, Dublin, Conference of Major Religious Superiors, 1991.

[86]Stephen Pattison, in *The Faith of the Managers*, London, Cassell, 1997, pp.88-98, brings out very powerfully the kinds of institutional exclusions into which managerialism is liable to slip. He refers to exclusions of the past, of limitation and failure, of diversity, of effective accountability, of the human and unpredictable, of the intangible, of the dark side. "The modern, managed, vision-driven organization

can...easily... become myopic, hierarchical, centralized, unegalitarian, self-centred and self-determined, aggressive, competitive, suspicious, dualistic, conformist, slightly paranoid and surprisingly, conservative." (*ibid.*, p.98) Although they are not the target of his criticism, Catholic schools need to beware that they are not immune from it.

[87]I have already referred (in chapters one and four) to aspects of the relationship between Catholicism and liberalism and to aspects of the tensions between Catholic education and liberal education. I say more about these interconnections in chapter five, sections two and three.

[88]John Langan, 'Catholicism and Liberalism', in *Liberalism and the Good*, edited by R. Bruce Douglass, Gerald Mara and Henry Richardson, New York, Routledge, 1990, pp.110-111.

[89]Michael Walzer traces the idea of thickness (with regard to interpretations of morality and of life generally) to Clifford Geertz's *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York, Basic Books, 1973. See Walzer's *Thick and Thin*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1994. Bernard Williams discusses thick concepts of morality in *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, London, Fontana, 1985, pp.129, 140, 143-145. Charles Taylor discusses the problematic nature of frameworks and strong evaluation which feature as central aspects of thick accounts of the good in *Sources of the Self*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989. T. H. McLaughlin has discussed thick and thin theories of the good in 'Values, Coherence and the School', in *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 24, no. 3, 1994, pp.453-470.

[90]The extent to which this phenomenon stems from the effects of continual secularisation, or from a decrease in the numbers, conviction or persuasiveness of Christians in the population as a whole, or from an increase in the confidence of those who had always resisted mainstream ideologies, values and lifestyles is open to question and certainly cannot be resolved here.

[91]See chapter two for figures indicating an increase in the numbers of staff and pupils in Catholic schools who do not share the Catholic faith. In recent disputes about what percentage of non-Catholic pupils might be admitted to Catholic schools without detriment to their religious ethos, the figure of 15% has sometimes been used as a rough guide. See James Arthur, *The Ebbing Tide*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1995, p.113.

[92]Some of these elements, for example, freedom of conscience and the importance of rationality, though historically associated with liberalism, could arguably be seen as implicit in Christianity, that is, their relationship is closer than a mere compatibility with it. Certainly Aquinas, in the thirteenth century, underlined the central importance of rationality in the Christian life, for example, in identifying, interpreting and following the natural law. He also connected the operation of conscience very closely with the exercise of rationality. See Brian Davies, *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992, pp.235-7.

[93]This point is developed further in chapter six.

[94]For further treatment of these points, see chapter seven.

[95]On the need for balance between parental rights, children's rights and the requirements of education, see Eamonn Callan, 'The Great Sphere: Education against Servility', *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* vol. 31, no. 2, July 1997, pp.221 - 232.

CHAPTER SIX

Living Tradition

Separate schooling based on a distinctive educational philosophy, one informed throughout by religious beliefs, might be called a holistic form of education. Such holistic education has to face a number of criticisms. These criticisms can be divided into two broad categories, those relating to the effects of this kind of education within schools, and those relating to its effects within society. In this chapter I seek to address the first type of criticism.

My main aim is to show that there are intellectual resources within Catholicism which facilitate the promotion of an education with the capacity to combine distinctiveness with inclusiveness (within the limits indicated in chapter five). Some of the (school-focused) criticisms which can be levelled against Catholic education become much less convincing, even if they cannot be totally rebutted, once account is taken of the potential role of an appropriation of 'living tradition'. In order to achieve my aim, first, I acknowledge that the emphasis on a distinctive approach to Catholic education can be criticised for the potentially malign aspect of its 'total' nature as well as for being narrow and inward-looking. Second, I explore the notion of 'living tradition' as offering a way of responding positively to these criticisms. Third, I summarise the immensely influential contribution of the French philosopher Maurice Blondel (1861-1949) to the Catholic church's understanding of 'living tradition'. My summary is based on the whole corpus of Blondel's diaries, essays, correspondence and major philosophical volumes. His work is almost unknown in England, largely because it remains (with only two exceptions) untranslated into English.[1] Fourth, I draw out the

implications for Catholic schools today of a Blondelian interpretation of living tradition and at the same time I show the relevance of these implications to my thesis.

6.1 Criticisms of holistic approach

The holistic approach to Catholic education has been criticised on the grounds that it leads to an authoritarian educational environment.[2] Cooper makes two important points which should cause Catholic educators to look carefully at their practice and its unintended side-effects: first, that the rights of older adolescents could be jeopardised by being subordinated to the wishes of their parents with regard to religious schooling, if this is conducted in too 'strong' an atmosphere; second, that "the maintenance of this [religious] community accentuates the exclusion of others; the articulation of school with Christian faith reproduces the other as outsider."[3] I do not think that these are automatic or necessary side-effects; they can certainly be minimised. One of Cooper's concerns about efforts on behalf of religion in education is that "faiths are seen as discrete phenomena that (should) remain pure, simple and relatively unchanging."[4] My treatment of living tradition should go some way towards alleviating this concern since it shows the capacity for a Catholic school to respond to its pupils as if they were subjects and partners, not merely objects and recipients of its work.

Thiessen acknowledges the possibility of an unhealthy form of Christian nurture which must be guarded against.[5] This would "fail to have as its goal the freeing of the child to make an 'independent' choice for or against Christian commitment". It would 'force' children to become Christians in a way that made sacramental initiation 'automatic', thereby "discouraging growth towards normal rational autonomy." Such unhealthy nurture "fails to cultivate a rational grounding for Christian convictions,"

and it also "fails to encourage children and students to grapple with the questions that inevitably arise." Other shortcomings include those of failing to "expose the maturing child to alternate belief systems" and neglecting "to teach students to respect people who are committed to other worldviews."[6] While Thiessen accepts that such failures would be serious defects, he argues that it is possible to nurture young people in a Christian environment in ways that protect and advance their sense of freedom and their rational powers, together with promoting their knowledge about and respect for others.[7]

There are other difficulties which follow from the holistic approach to Catholic education. Some of these difficulties have already emerged from my analysis of inclusiveness and exclusiveness, for example, the challenge presented by a holistic approach to the notion of the autonomy of the disciplines, a concept which we have seen is part of that central core of key principles underpinning Catholic education.

The interpretation of an integral and inclusive spirituality, as seen in von Hügel, (chapter three) should help in removing fears that religion will necessarily play an overdominant role in relation to the autonomy of the different areas of the curriculum. It will not, however, remove fears on the part of some teachers that their expected exemplification of such an inclusive spirituality will be experienced as a constraint on their freedom of action and interpretation. Teachers working in a Catholic school which has articulated the nature of its distinctiveness might well feel that there is some tension between the collective view they are expected to promote and their own individual interpretation. Those who do not share the collective view will find it much harder to 'plough their own furrow' where explicit clarification of a school's Catholic nature has been carried out. Will they feel able to contest the institution's view of truth on grounds that it is unhealthily narrow, inflexible, intolerant, or in some other

way deficient?[8] It might also be argued that there is a problem as to which holistic view is being promoted, since there are important differences which flow from the various models of church, revelation and faith which are available within the Christian churches and within the Catholic church in particular.[9]

Other criticisms have been levelled recently against the emphasis on distinctiveness within Christian education. These include the accusations that such a concern leads to schools being inward-looking, overconcerned with boundaries, reifying Christianity, over-valuing beliefs, idealising theology and being blind to pluralism.[10] Hull suggests that there is a danger that the concern for wholeness can slip into a form of totalitarianism. Adrian Thatcher also warns of the danger of over-emphasising religious differences.[11] He argues that, by their focus on religious difference, Christians might neglect other kinds of difference.[12] Both Hull and Thatcher rely on a retrieval of emphasis on the Holy Spirit rather than the person of Jesus Christ, which leads them to argue for a degree of openness which puts church schools under some strain and challenges them to display a much greater solidarity with the wider human race, especially those most in need.

While a renewed consciousness of the universal presence of God, the call for greater sensitivity to differences other than religious and the challenge to demonstrate greater solidarity with the whole of humanity are all to be welcomed, none of these necessarily undermine the very *raison d'etre* of church schools, although they do place onerous - and appropriate - expectations on them. Two comments are in order here. I accept the positive case put forward by Hull and Thatcher for a more open and inclusive approach by Christians in education, but I reject the negative implications of their argument.

First, Hull's view seems to me to trade on something which depends on the institutional preservation (admittedly plural in form) of Christianity. Unless there exist 'identity-sustaining rules of Christian discourse and behaviour',[13] that is, unless there is tradition which is embodied in some way, with a degree of stability and continuity, rooted in texts, practices and institutions which prevail over time, our reconstruction and application of Christian faith to changing circumstances and needs will not be possible. The emphasis on distinctiveness may be carried too far; Hull's warning here is salutary. But it does not have to be a distraction from fulfilling the Christian mission to live for others. Clarifying distinctiveness can serve instead as a necessary preliminary to and accompaniment of an outward-looking approach, first in order to be clear about the nature of the task and the direction to be taken, second in order to recognise temptations which might lead us astray and to allow for readjustment of direction if wrong routes have been taken.

The kind of development in Christian approaches to education outlined by Hull, from education for Christendom, to education for Christianity, to education for Christianness,[14] depends upon a supporting structure and an institutional embodiment which facilitates, stimulates and guides the practice of a critical yet faithful reflection on the implications of the Gospel and its relationship to the changing circumstances of our lives. Hull and Thatcher's trenchant criticisms of those who are too concerned with defending distinctiveness and integrity within Christian education run the risk of cutting the ground from under Christian educators. As Christian educators widen the focus of their attention and extend the scope of their efforts, the foundations on which they stand could be neglected.

These two writers helpfully remind us of God's universal salvific concern, the unpredictable and unbounded operation of the Holy Spirit, the tendency among

Christians to be both inward-looking and defensive, the neglect of important aspects of difference and the need for Christians to be more open to the presence of God in people of other faiths - and of no explicit religious faith. They also challenge their fellow Christians to be more generous with their talents and resources and to travel more lightly in regard to their tradition. But there is the danger that in so concentrating on widening the scope of *who* we are *for,* we neglect the sources of our faith, and forget *where* we stand and *why* we face in this direction and have these priorities.

My first response to Hull and Thatcher's critique of some features of church schools, then, is to draw attention to the need for a living tradition which preserves the 'identity-sustaining rules of Christian discourse and behaviour' mentioned by Lash. My second and briefer comment is related to this. It is possible for there to be so much emphasis on taking down boundaries, in order to demonstrate openness, that the substance of our message about salvation gets dissipated. It would be like seeking to keep up performances of a play or a piece of music while being careless about the foundation text on which they draw. In so attending to the needs of the differing audiences we face, (which is commendable in itself), we might forget or distort the original 'score'.[15] The kind of solidarity advocated by Hull and Thatcher could, as Kevin Nichols puts it, "easily result in total assimilation; with church schools surviving only as the smile on the face of the tiger."[16]

6.2 Living Tradition

The notion of living tradition, as articulated by several of the writers mentioned below, allows Catholics to avoid two possible dangers in the process of educating from a religious worldview: ossification as well as assimilation. The first danger is

that tradition will be held to so inflexibly and with such little attention to the changing circumstances of each age that it becomes ossified.[17] Its borders will be protected from perceived threats so effectively that contact with what is 'other', perplexing, or challenging will be prevented. Loyalty to the past might be given such importance that it becomes almost an idolatry. The status attributed to past teaching is so high that little room is left for independent judgement on the part of learners and no opportunity offered to engage with new situations that have not already been addressed by the tradition. Questioning is seen as betrayal.

Such 'immobility' is often a feature of a 'classicist' outlook, where the agencies and criteria for controlling tradition are thought of as both 'universal' and 'fixed for all time'.[18] This does not leave sufficient room for the input or contribution of the learner to the transformation of what he or she is learning.[19] It prevents "the very activities which can keep a tradition alive, namely, those exercises of judgement and imagination by which it can be cleansed and renewed and fitted to new circumstances."[20] Such a 'classicist' outlook also obstructs communication with those from different cultures, since it refuses to accept the legitimacy of using resources from outside its own 'borders'.[21] It fails to do justice to history, to changing contexts or to pluralism. Lonergan calls such a classicism "the shabby shell of Catholicism", for it relies too little on the love of God and the multiple dimensions of conversion.[22]

Nichols points out that tradition is not the handing on of something inert, like a 'baton in a relay' race, nor is it something into which we are moulded indiscriminately.[23] Rather we are to understand tradition as 'the transmitted life of a community'. Nichols' point here is that 'life' is suggestive of something much more dynamic, expansive and multi-dimensional than the handing on of beliefs. To live tradition, as opposed merely to repeat it, involves, for Nichols, innovation and creativity as well as

respect for the past and loyalty to it. The art of living a tradition demands a 'creative fidelity'.[24]

Fidelity and creativity do not have to be seen as opposed to one another; they can be held together. This is important in the context of Catholic schools, where a balance has to be struck between faithfulness to tradition and an openness to the experience and insights of present members of the school community. In the attempt to put the Gospel into practice, fresh interpretation, not mere repetition, can be a form of bearing witness and making a contribution. On the other hand, in the context of encouraging pupils and staff to engage with the missionary imperative of the Gospel, we may find that the effort of appropriating a text which at first appears to be alien to us, if followed by appreciation of its meaning, can lead us to a deeper self-discovery and a sense that life is both enhanced and liberated, rather than diminished and constrained.

In order to guard against the second danger, that of assimilation, where secularization is "bleaching the Catholic character out of that church's educational institutions",[25] there will be a degree of moulding, or formation, and this will be a forming of "faith, character and consciousness".[26] This formation is expected, within a Christian perspective, to convert us from self-seeking, misguided orientations and valuing what is unworthy of our vocation to holiness.[27] The horizons which are available at any one time to the learner depend on the extent to which he or she has undergone previous conversions. What will appear as problematical or what will appear as offering a solution will depend on these conversions and their effects on our horizons.

Those, like Westerhoff and Nichols, who emphasise formation in the process of living a tradition, intend to prevent that total assimilation to secular culture which they fear

might be a possible outcome of engaging openly with the questions that culture puts to Christians. They expect Christian education to be carried out in the ambience of an active communion within a church. Otherwise there is a danger that the openness that is part of avoiding ossification will slide into emptiness, so that there is no distinct Christian identity being maintained. Burtchaell makes a complaint about Catholic higher education in the USA that some might extend further. "What was first intended unreflectively as an act of denominational ecumenism devolves into interdenominational vagueness and then into nondenominational secularism."[28]

In the spectrum of commitment which may be expected within a church school the notion of living tradition can help us to see that "there is no incompatibility between whole-hearted faith and openness to criticism"[29] and that we can find an appropriate stance "between non-betrayal and maximum devotion".[30] If 'immobility' is impossible for authentic Christianity, a retrieval of the notion of living tradition should remind us that so too is 'radical novelty'; if the former is 'infantile', the latter is scarcely an improvement in being 'adolescent'.[31] The first danger I have mentioned, that of the ossification of tradition, runs the risk, in the context of education in general and of church schools in particular, that it will lead teachers to forget that they have not been young in *these* circumstances, in the current situation facing pupils, with its own, new opportunities and temptations. Furthermore, it might mislead them into thinking that they can pass on to their pupils the wisdom derived from past experience, without an ability to learn from the present. This would prevent the young from growing up properly into a discerning religious understanding and a responsible moral maturity. They would be kept in a childish condition.

The second danger, where there is an excess of openness and critical questioning and where the readiness to forget or to modify tradition in the face of the new can slide

into assimilation, also prevents proper development beyond the stage of adolescence. By favouring change always at the cost of continuity, such an approach undercuts the necessary stability of perspective and the personal foundation needed for constructive action and decision-making on the part of pupils. Schillebeeckx puts the need for a balance to be struck in the following way:

> The Christian *perception of* the meaning of the offer of revelation comes about in a creative *giving* of meaning: in a new production of meaning or a re-reading of the Bible and the tradition of faith within constantly new situations of every kind....Our 'situations' or contexts have new insights and particular sensitivities but also their own blindspots, one-sidedness and prejudices.[32]

My treatment of the notion of living tradition as a possible way of combining distinctiveness with inclusiveness can be seen to fit in well with the wider epistemological and hermeneutical movement of which Gadamer is a leading proponent.[33] Gadamer shows the intimate connections between the kinds of knowledge we arrive at and the situations in which we find ourselves, the prejudgements and assumptions fed to us by the traditions we inherit, from which we draw and to which we contribute. Our interpretations and understanding of life do not start from a blank sheet. Nor do they do emerge from a position of pure detachment. They build upon some prior (if provisional) commitment. They are always already oriented and guided by some form of anticipation built up in us. This anticipation is filtered through the categories provided for us in the 'texts' which inform our conceptual inheritance.[34] Although we always remain inextricably part of one tradition or another, in our use of the mental 'tools' it offers we are able to modify it, sometimes significantly.[35] The attempt to engage the tradition, whether to live it out or to reject it, inevitably influences its development.[36] Our conversations with tradition and our attempts to 'apply' it to our circumstances will in turn also change us,

in that they will confront us with its strangeness as well as its familiarity; this strangeness will surprise us, "bring us up short" and cause us to revise our earlier views.[37]

6.3 Blondel and Living Tradition

Probably no one has contributed more effectively to the notion of living tradition in the Catholic church than the French philosopher Maurice Blondel (1861 -1949). He pointed the way to a notion of tradition which serves not only to conserve but also to discover. It is possible to detect his influence on the thinking of key twentieth century Catholic theologians, such as Karl Rahner (via Maréchal), Henri de Lubac (via Valensin), Yves Congar and Teilhard de Chardin and thereby to trace his imprint on the Second Vatican Council, an imprint which was indirect since it passed through the intermediary work of others.[38] One of the leading American contemporary theologians, Avery Dulles, comments positively on Blondel's

> dynamic and expansive notion of tradition, in which believers are prepared to achieve new insights through the pursuit of discipleship and engagement in the practices characteristic of committed Christians,[39]

and he welcomes Blondel's contribution as a way forward from the one-sided and inadequate view of tradition which prevailed at the beginning of this century. Drawing upon a range of Blondel's work, I shall first summarise his key insights and illustrate his contributions to Catholic thinking on the notion of living tradition and then briefly indicate some of the educational implications which follow from such a Blondelian emphasis together with their particular relevance to the thesis being argued here.[40]

The essay which provides several of Blondel's seminal ideas on living tradition is *History and Dogma.* This originated in a number of articles which appeared in 1904 as a contribution to the controversy about the role of historical criticism in the Church's life. Blondel claimed to point a way forward which both avoided the pitfalls of those who fixed the Church in a restricting and narrow immobilism, and also escaped the dangers stemming from those who yielded too much to contemporary scholarship. Blondel believed that God's last word has not been spoken; Christ is still communicating as he promised he would: "I still have many things to say to you but they would be too much for you now. But when the Spirit of truth comes, he will lead you to the complete truth" (John16,12). This truth cannot be contained in a purely intellectual manner, for this would bypass those who find this difficult. Furthermore, the truth that comes from God lies always beyond mere human formulations and cannot be captured in them. "There can be no given moment of history when the mind of man has exhausted the mind of God."[41]

The only way we can enjoy the truth is by drawing upon the collective experience derived from faithful action by the church's members. Tradition makes it possible for something to pass from the implicitly lived to the explicitly known.[42] The overall way of life of the Church carries more riches than can be unpacked and passed into currrency at any one particular epoch of its existence. Tradition is a

> living synthesis of all the speculative and ascetic, historic and theological forces...It embraces the data of history, the efforts of reason and the experiences of faithful action.[43]

In this synthesis we all have a contribution to make, for tradition is to do with the whole body of the Church, not just any particular privileged section of it.

> Without the Church, the faithful could not detect the true hand of God in the Bible and souls; but, unless each believer brought his little contribution to the common life, the organism would not be fully alive and spiritual.[44]

Blondel feared that some scholars had exaggerated the power of historical investigation, while other scholars had overrated the efficacy of philosophical reasoning. In accessing the truth about God's ways and purposes, these two forms of human enquiry are inadequate. Despite the need for both, something more is required: "the mediation of collective life and the slow progressive labour of the Christian tradition."[45] There is a certain light shed by the orderly and repeated performances of Christian practices:

> faithful action is the Ark of the Covenant where the confidences of God are found, the Tabernacle where he perpetuates his presence and his teaching.[46]

There is, for Blondel, a kind of meaning and verification carried in our action which goes beyond the competence of our powers of reasoning. As he says,

> a man can carry out completely what he cannot entirely understand, and in doing it he keeps alive within him the consciousness of a reality which is still half hidden from him. To 'keep' the word of God means in the first place to do it, to put it into practice.[47]

According to Blondel, a dialectic between devotions and truth operates in such a way that the humble faithful can benefit from a profound intuition more penetrating than that enjoyed by the most erudite of intellectuals.[48] Furthermore, he thought that dogmas and the practices enjoined on us by the Church, when put together, make one body and it would be 'murderous vivisection' to try to separate them.[49] The constant theme echoing throughout Blondel's writings comes from St John : he who does the truth comes to the light. In *History and Dogma* he puts it thus: "the miracle of the

Christian life is that from acts at first difficult, obscure and enforced, one rises to the light through a practical verification of speculative truths".[50]

Following this presentation of faithful action as the focus of tradition, we are reminded by Blondel that there can be no doctrinal unity without a prior common discipline and a conformity of lifestyle.[51] Joint action (and even more, shared suffering) would open the way for greater unity than could ever be achieved by a theological vanguard or pioneer elite group. To pay attention to tradition as a whole, rather than giving emphasis to only part of it, enables us not only to preserve what is valuable from the past (this much at least about tradition is commonly appreciated) but to move forward, for

> its powers of conservation are equalled by its powers of conquest. (Tradition) discovers and formulates truths on which the past lived, though unable as yet to evaluate or define them explicitly.[52]

We should, therefore, be wary of shedding too quickly or casually those aspects of the Christian tradition which do not easily 'make sense' to us, those features which jar on our understanding or sensibilities. It may be that through an uncomfortable confrontation between the expectations of a living tradition and the individuality of our own experience there is an opportunity to avoid illusion and to widen our horizons.

Blondel did not advocate an uncritical acceptance of all features of the Church. He was well aware of many defects in the Church he loved and he realized that purification was necessary as part of the process of building a new synthesis for his time. He could be scathing about some aspects of church life and especially a distorted view of authority then operative in the higher echelons of the clergy. Coming from such a man, from the centre, these criticisms have all the more force.

The predominant party in the church (at the beginning of the twentieth century), Blondel believed, was wrong to exercise a power that was political, rather than spiritual in style, for this was incompatible with the Gospel. The Church was supposed to serve, not tyrannise over souls.[53] It seemed to Blondel that the face of the Church too often presented to the world was a serious aberration from the ideal : "a Catholicism without Christ, religion without a soul, authority without a heart".[54] It was wrong to think that God could be served by making him reign in society without preparing souls to receive him.[55] The emphasis on ecclesiastical imperialism and prestige, which he decried, is a far cry from the strength that comes from weakness; the former smacks of paganism, whereas the latter comes closer to Christianity. Blondel insisted first, that authority is assisted but not inspired, and second, such authority must consult and be clarified and joined by the prayer and study of the faithful; it should not flow just one way, from above to below. Authority is an organ of tradition, not a replacement for it.[56] Though he did not minimize the principle of authority, Blondel certainly rejected authoritarianism in the Church, because it exalts a part of tradition above the whole in a most unhealthy manner for the body which shares Christ's life.

Nothing illustrated the misuse of authority more for him than the dangerous distortion of clericalism. This was endemic in the church at the beginning of the twentieth century, inherent in the one-way thinking which saw everything in terms of from above to below, an over-hierarchical conception of the Church. He saw rule by clergy was a kind of guardianship over minors who were never allowed to grow up, take risks or show any initiative. "Clericalism", said Blondel,

> is founded on an objectivism which identifies the human container with the divine content'; it is behind the immobile mentality prevalent within the Church and also responsible for much of its fanaticism and lack of humanity.[57]

He considered it

> the most dangerous of traitors, the most false-hearted and deadly of the enemies of Catholicism, since it contradicts the essence of the Church and makes of it a sect, something unilateral, formal, intellectual, neither good, loving, nor lovable.[58]

The stress given by Blondel to the contribution of the whole body of the faithful in his treatment of living tradition differed greatly from the distinction which was too sharply made earlier this century between the teaching and the learning church, the clergy and the laity. If the laity were always treated like children, he wondered, how could candidates for the teaching Church ever be recruited; from such juvenile and inexperienced sheep, how could wise pastors be found?[59]

In 1946, at the age of eighty five, Blondel returned again to the topic of tradition and the need to balance the risks of growth with the need to safeguard the church against specious novelties.[60] He continued to emphasise that the transmission of truths, functions and powers involved in tradition requires from the faithful more than a simple acceptance. He remained supremely confident about the "unquenchable power of enriching invention" which resided within tradition.[61] It is not a chain which has to be dragged along, weighing us down; rather it should be thought of as an umbilical cord, providing lifeblood and nourishment.[62] In these last comments on tradition he reiterated his earlier themes: tradition and innovation are not opposed to one another; responding to the promptings of the Spirit and submission to authority are not incompatible; revelation is inexhaustible; the church lives through growth; each generation has its trials, its mission and its effective fruitfulness in adapting what is permanent and what is moving in the church to one another.[63]

6.4 Educational Implications

Some of the concerns about the promotion of a strong ethos in Catholic schools might be alleviated by Blondel's interpretation of living tradition. On the one hand, there might be concerns about a certain rigidity, immobility or fixedness within the church and therefore also in its approach to education. Following Mitchell, I called this the danger of ossification. How could fidelity to tradition be combined with both an openness to criticism (from within as well as from beyond those committed to the faith) and also a creativity and flexibility in adapting to the changing circumstances and questions of each new generation? Too fixed an understanding of tradition would leave little room for the contribution of pupils or staff and could even invite too authoritarian an approach to education which cramped the development of pupils and undermined the possibility of their growing into a mature and responsible autonomy. Such an emphasis might also, I suggested, unduly restrict teachers in church schools, make excessive demands on them in their role as exemplars of faith and even give inadequate attention to their rights to freedom of conscience and self-expression.

On the other hand, an excess of openness and modification of tradition in order to meet the needs and priorities of each new age might dissolve the distinctiveness of the Catholic identity and undermine the mission of church schools. I called this the danger of assimilation. In several respects the outline I have given of the Blondelian approach to living tradition offers guidance for church schools on how to address these concerns and suggests a nuanced understanding which allows Catholic educators to avoid these dangers. Let me draw out some of the implications for schools of Blondel's comments on living tradition.

First, undue weight is not to be given to the past. Rather than being backward-looking, seeking always to preserve, to repeat, to transmit, church schools should, in the light of a rich appreciation that tradition is living, respond to the changing circumstances and new questions facing pupils and staff. What kind of balance is struck, in the course of each year's work, to ensure that pupils are invited, not only to enter into the educational and ecclesial heritage from the past, but also to respond to the concerns and questions thrown up by new circumstances through their own contributions and projects?

Second, Blondel reminds us that, if tradition is to flourish and to be welcomed, there must be due emphasis given to the experience, insights, problems and questions of the particular members of the school community, both pupils and staff. Furthermore, each person should be able to feel that his or her contribution is needed and valued by the school community. How hard do our schools try to communicate to all pupils that their questions are taken seriously and that they have particular talents which both the school and the wider society (including the parish) is in need of?

This leads into the third implication of Blondel's analysis of living tradition, which is that the church's representatives cannot be credible or effective teachers if they are not simultaneously still learners. They must not give the impression of having 'arrived' or of being 'complete' and therefore of having stopped developing. They should be models, not only of life-long learning in academic terms , but also of life-long growth in faith and an ever deepening appreciation of the mysteries of God's world and ways. If one side of this coin is that Blondel believed that the church could not claim to teach if she was not prepared to go on learning, the other aspect of this is that the church cannot expect her members to receive what she has to offer if at the same time she does not allow the learners themselves to give, to make a contribution, so that

there is a certain reciprocity about the teaching and learning process. It follows from this that teachers will elicit and respond positively to feedback from their pupils about the helpfulness of their endeavours; that they will model commitment to devotional practices; and that they will demonstrate to these pupils a familiarity with the discipline, lifestyle and feelings associated with being a pupil (for example, excitement in finding new ideas and a desire for feedback on their own progress).

Fourth, Blondel's comments warn against the church school adopting an overbearing attitude in its efforts to convey the truth, even salvific truth. Its tutelary role should never slip into tyranny. There must be room for questioning, for disagreement, for learning by mistakes, for exploration, even when this appears to stray from orthodoxy. The church school should seek to serve its pupils, not keep them in a state of servility. This will require an atmosphere which facilitates discussion and debate, which invites pupils to exercise responsibility and to show initiative in a variety of forms and contexts, and which also allows them to withdraw (without reprimand) from these if they choose.

If in this point Blondel warns against too premature closing of argument, this is related to a fifth implication of his thought, namely that church schools should take care to avoid an excessive reliance on a narrow interpretation of rationality as the only means to arrive at truth. In addition to the usual modes of detached and impartial academic reasoning there should be an openness to broader forms of rationality, for example, a readiness to learn from poetry and the arts, from personal experience and collaborative action, from spirituality and worship.[64] His comments about moving slowly from the implicitly lived to the explicitly known, about attending to the multiple dimensions of life and about the integral development of the human person, should guard us against any over-intellectual emphasis or any compartmentalisation of

knowledge or separation of the curriculum from the devotions, problems and practices experienced by members of the school community. An excessive over-reliance on rationality will be avoided if the curriculum is broad and balanced; if pedagogy allows for pupil input, as well as reception; if it responds sensitively to pupil feedback; if many forms of achievement are praised; if all pupils are encouraged to experiment, to cooperate, to offer and to receive help; and if the school community shares its sorrows, highlights its concerns, values and priorities, and celebrates its achievements through sacred and secular rituals.

This brings us to a sixth implication. If there is to be no sharp separation of academic from more 'existential' concerns within a school, the school should expect to train its members in faithful action, both in its devotional expression and in social action. There would be formation in spirituality and in community service and these would be seen as mutually supportive strands.[65] Associated with these practices the school should be prepared to retain those aspects of the tradition which might appear at first to be uncomfortable for its members, for example, the call to self-denial, to on-going and ever-deepening conversion, to loyalty to and engagement with the *whole* liturgical cycle and its constitutive elements, not just to those which readily appeal or those which are easily understandable.

Seventh, not only did Blondel display in his own teaching all the qualities of inclusiveness which I touched upon in chapter five,[66] in his writing he urged a sensitivity to the differing spiritual, intellectual and personal needs of learners. His comments about the need for adaptability on the part of the teacher echo contemporary calls for attention to differentiation in approaches to teaching and learning. Blondel advocated patience in the face of misunderstanding, confusion, error and shortcomings. In avoiding an overbearing atmosphere the school will not

seek too quickly to uproot the weed growing alongside of the wheat.[67] Blondel always displayed a high degree of both patience and precision in pointing out mistakes and distortions, but he also advocated that searchers needed a friendly space in which to develop and to try out their ideas. Teachers in Catholic schools should be noted for this form of 'hospitality'.

Such patience did not imply an undiscriminating tolerance. The eighth implication of Blondel's understanding of living tradition is that a degree of vigilance is required in order to safeguard the church, and, by extension, also the school, against the corrosive effects of what I called in 5.2.3 'acid', that is, thought or practices which either directly or more subtly undermine the mission of the church school. Some priorities in the educational world will appear in the light of such vigilance to damage the carefully nurtured 'wine' of Catholic education, either by 'watering it down' or by mixing it with 'acid'. Threatening elements might be forms of competitiveness within and between schools; unbalanced kinds of curriculum, pedagogy or policies for assessment and behaviour; distorted expressions of egalitarianism; or concessions to pluralism or to a liberal view of education. If our openness to the continuing unfolding of truth made accessible to us by the Holy Spirit entails remaining in communion with the wider church (and therefore not acting as if the school were an island, operating in isolation from the rest of the church), so too our vigilance or safeguarding role must be carried out in harmony with that wider ecclesial communion. Our nurturing of living tradition is not for the sake of ourselves alone, but it is to be exercised on behalf of the whole church. In this light, a Catholic school will engage positively with the oversight and inspection which is carried out on behalf of the church.

I have shown how Blondel's treatment of living tradition offers helpful guidance for the task of combining fidelity and creativity in the context of a Catholic school. If real

contact with active minds is to be made, then new intellectual creations are necessary, Blondel would say, not because former ways of expressing the faith are easily dispensable but because further explorations of the riches of the faith are essential for effective communication with outsiders, indeed often extremely helpful for promoting deeper understanding of the legacy of faith for insiders too.[68]

I have also brought out some of the features which would make such schools both distinctive and inclusive, without being totally 'open' in the some of the senses entailed by a more liberal view of education which prevails in secular schools. If we adopt a Blondelian perspective, there are limits to the extent to which we are able to mark the boundaries of the distinctiveness of the church or of the church school, because no definition of pure Christianity is possible since it is a living reality, not a concept or theory, and introducing someone to the faith is bringing them into a way of life, not to a mere acceptance of a formula.[69] Ossification and immobility are incompatible with living tradition, a notion which implies a church on the move. Blondel considered that the capacity for movement was integral to the church's nature and mission. His view was that if we wish to win souls and to spread the good news of Christ (as opposed to defending institutions), this is best done from a moving vehicle, not from a fortress.[70]

In order to pass on a faith in the context of living tradition, according to Blondel, a blend of docility and initiative is required; docility to tradition and also to the needs of others, initiative to adapt the life of tradition to the needs of individuals. He employed the imagery of music and text to bring out this blend. Faith as docility on its own is like music that is written but remains on the page unplayed; faith as confidence and trust and initiative is like music that is played, but without the text is in danger of rambling away pointlessly and getting lost.[71] An appreciation of living tradition provides several pointers as to how a Catholic school might attempt to promote in its

pupils an active receptivity, a critical solidarity and a discerning openness. An appropriation of living tradition, along the lines suggested by Blondel, makes it possible for Catholic schools to maintain their distinctiveness while displaying an openness to the insights and questions of pupils and to the changing needs of the times.

Blondel was, of course, not the only major exponent of living tradition to have influenced modern Catholic thought. Both Möhler and Newman in the nineteenth century highlighted key aspects which contributed to later thinking on living tradition; thus Möhler stressed the role of the Holy Spirit in the experience of the faithful, while Newman significantly advanced our understanding of the development of doctrine.[72] But by bringing together reason, experience and faith, by giving emphasis to the collective experience of the faithful, by showing the relationship between devotion and arriving at the truth, by describing a more healthy role for authority than prevailed in the church of his time, and by showing how tradition can facilitate a meeting place for what is permanent and what is changing in the life of the church, Blondel powerfully enhanced the Catholic Church's ability to appreciate and to apply the notion of living tradition to its own self-understanding.[73] In doing so he has bequeathed a legacy which can assist Catholic educators in guarding against at least some of the risks to which any substantive worldview and any associated 'strong' school ethos are prone.[74]

6.5 Conclusion

The notion of 'living tradition' has been examined for the light it can cast on the task of combining distinctiveness with inclusiveness in such a way as to avoid the dangers of either ossification or assimilation. Key insights from Blondel, a major and

influential exponent of the notion of 'living tradition', have been retrieved and applied to my consideration of the coherence of the claim of Catholic education to be both distinctive and inclusive.

The analysis so far has concentrated mainly on the implications *within* Catholic schools of a distinctive philosophy of education. I now address potential criticisms of the effects of distinctive and separate Catholic schools in terms of their place in a liberal and pluralist society. My response to these criticisms will lead me to argue that Catholic schools can be shown, both in principle and in practice, to contribute to the common good.

Notes and references for chapter six

[1]There is no major summary, presentation or analysis of the full range of Blondel's philosophical and religious thought available in English. Much of his voluminous output has long been unavailable even in French, although that is beginning to be rectified with the gradual publication of a critical edition of his work by Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1995-. Even for native French speakers/readers, many find Blondel inaccessible because of the complexity of his arguments, the difficulty of his language and the frequently tortuous nature of his style. The position is further complicated by the fact that Blondel often wrote his more controversial (religious) works under a pseudonym, employing at different times eight such pseudonyms! My claim that, despite this obscurity, Blondel exerted considerable influence on the development of a Catholic understanding of tradition, is rendered less strange when it is realized that none of the important architects of the church's re-thinking at the Second Vatican Council (with the exception of the longer-term influence of Newman) were English; they were either French or German. See the opening paragraph of section 6.3.

[2]Padraig Hogan is critical of those who entertain "strong proprietorial designs on the emergent identities of learners...who have a right to be different...without fear of discrimination." Although his target is much broader than Catholic education, this form of education does not escape unscathed. ('Identity, Difference and the Epiphanies of Learning', unpublished paper delivered at Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain, Oxford, April, 1997, pp.213, 214. On authoritarianism as a feature of more general attempts (beyond Catholic schools) to restore the position of Christianity in education, see Davina Cooper, 'Strategies of Power: Legislating Worship and Religious Education', in *The Impact of Michel Foucault on the Social Sciences and Humanities*, edited by Moya Lloyd and Andrew Thacker, London, Macmillan, 1997.

[3]Cooper, *ibid.*, p.164.

[4]*Ibid.*, p.159.

[5]Elmer Thiessen, 'Fanaticism and Christian Liberal Education', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, vol 15, 1996, pp.293-300. Thiessen is responding to a review article (in the same journal, pp.281-291) by Ben Spiecker, 'Commitment to Liberal Education', about his book *Teaching for Commitment*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1993.

[6]Thiessen (1996), *op. cit.*, pp.298-299. Eamonn Callan points out that understanding ethical diversity presupposes independent thought. If parents wish to shield their family from influences which they shun as threatening to their own way of life, this is likely to lead to ethical servility and ignorant antipathy on the part of their children, rather than independent thinking or personal sovereignty. Callan, 'The Great Sphere: Education Against Servility', *Journal of Philosophy of Education.*, vol. 31, no. 2, July 1997, pp.222 - 224, 226-9.

[7]*Ibid.* For a more detailed defence of this argument see Thiessen (1993).

[8]The danger of strong institutional mission leading to authoritarianism is vividly described by Stephen Pattison. (*The Faith of the Managers*, London, Cassell, 1997, p.71). In commenting on some features of managerialism more generally, but which can be applied to schools, Pattison says "some kinds of idealization and perfectionism can be extremely unhelpful and oppressive, creating false, unrealizable hopes for users and service providers alike." (*ibid.*, p.80)

[9]See appendix 2 for references to work of Avery Dulles.

[10]John Hull, unpublished paper given at an International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996, 'The Holy Trinity and the Mission of the Church School'. *cf.* Hull's chapter 'A Critique of Christian Religionism in Recent British Education' in Jeff Astley and Leslie Francis (eds) *Christian Theology & Religious Education*, London, SPCK, 1996.

[11]Adrian Thatcher (1996) unpublished paper at International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996 : 'Making the Difference - Theology of Education and Church Schools'.

[12]*Ibid.*, pp.4, 5. "The most serious problem about differentiating between people on religious grounds at all, is that other differences are overlooked or altogether ignored. ...There are also huge differences between people within the same religion."

[13]Nicholas Lash, *Easter in Ordinary*, London, SCM Press, 1988, pp. 259, 271, 272.

[14]Hull, *loc.cit.*, p.1.

[15]For two helpful discussions on the notions of 'score' and 'performance' in the context of preserving both fidelity and creativity, see R.M. Rummery, *Catechesis and Religious Education in a Pluralistic Society*, Sydney, Dwyer, 1975, p.195, and N. Lash, *Theology on the Way to Emmaus*, London, SCM, 1986, chapter three. Trevor Cooling draws on an extended image of New Testament theologian Tom Wright to show how creativity and flexibility with regard to interpreting a text and rendering it relevant and applicable to new contexts must be balanced by fidelity and consistency to that which is drawn upon. He uses the model of the finding of a new Shakespeare play, where we have to construct the fifth Act, which is not in our possession, in such a way that it fits in with and develops further the first four Acts, which we do possess. In such a context, creativity is not ruled out; indeed it is called for; but this will be a creativity which is constrained by the existing (incomplete) text. See Trevor Cooling's chapter in J. Astley & L. Francis (eds), *Christian Theology and Religious Education: Connections & Contradictions*, London, SPCK, 1996. See also Cooling, *A Christian Vision for State Education*, London, SPCK, 1994, pp. 154-159, for further treatment, in the context of evangelical theology, of some of the issues relating to normativity and contextualisation of the gospel in changing cultural circumstances.

[16]K. Nichols, 'Theology and the Dual System', unpublished paper for International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996, p.5.

[17]Basil Mitchell, *Faith and Criticism*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994, p.3.

[18]Nicholas Lash, *Theology on the Way to Emmaus*, London, SCM, 1986, pp.20, 53. and also Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, London, Darton, Longman &

Todd, 1972, p.29. For Lonergan, the classicist never departs from accepted terminology and mistakenly views culture as normative, rather than as empirical, assuming there is only one human culture, instead of many. (*Ibid.*, p.124.) Such a person is opposed to the historicity of dogma and relies too much on abstract logic, thereby displaying a lack of concreteness and breadth of approach. (*Ibid.*, pp.326, 338-39.) "Classicist education was a matter of models to be imitated, of ideal characters to be emulated, of eternal verities and universally valid laws." (*Ibid.*, p.301.)

[19]Yet, as Lonergan argues, "doctrines that really are assimilated bear the stamp of those who assimilate them, and the absence of such an imprint would point to a merely perfunctory assimilation." (*Ibid.*, pp.300-1.)

[20]Charles Wood, 'Theological inquiry and theogical education' in Astley, Francis and Crowder (eds), *Theological Perspectives on Christan Formation*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1996, p.354.

[21]But "if one is to communicate with persons of another culture, one must use the resources of their culture." (Lonergan, *op.cit.*, p.300.)

[22]*Ibid.*, p.327.

[23]K. Nichols, 'Imagination and Tradition in Religion and Education', in Astley and Francis (eds), *Christian Theology & Religious Education*, 1996, p.189.

[24]*Ibid.*, pp.190-1. See also Nicholas Lash, *Theology on the Way to Emmaus*, London, SCM, 1986, p.40. "There is a creativity in interpretation which, far from being arbitrary (the players cannot do whatever they like with the score) is connected in some way with the fidelity, the 'truthfulness' of their performance." See also Francis Sullivan, *Creative Fidelity*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1996. For a recent attempt to launch a major public debate on how to proceed with creative fidelity in the late twentieth century (American) Catholic church, one which turned out to be highly controversial, see 'The Common Ground Project - Called to be Catholic', by Cardinal Joseph Bernadin, *Doctrine & Life*, vol. 46, October 1996, pp.490 -496.

[25]James Burtchaell, in *Schooling Christians*, edited by Stanley Hauerwas & John Westerhoff, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Eerdmans, 1992, p.181. Burtchaell's particular concern is with Catholic higher education although his point that "there is a strenuous determination to be acknowledged as Catholic while disclaiming accountability to church superintendency" would be seen by some as having a wider application.

[26]See John Westerhoff, in Hauerwas & Westerhoff, *op.cit.*, p.267.

[27]See Bernard Lonergan, *op.cit.*, p.131. "Conversion, as lived, affects all of a man's conscious and intentional operations. It directs his gaze, pervades his imagination, releases the symbols that penetrate to the depths of his psyche. It enriches his understanding, guides his judgements, reinforces his decisions." The conversions Lonergan refers to are intellectual, moral and religious. These do not guarantee intellectual infallibility, moral perfection or spiritual sanctity. See J.W. Sullivan, 'Lonergan, Conversion and Objectivity' in *Theology*, vol. LXXXVI, 1983, pp.345-352, for further treatment of these issues.

[28]Burtchaell, *loc. cit.*, p.179. He argues (p.181.) that "[t]he only plausible way for a college or university to be significantly Christian is for it to function as a congregation in active communion within a church. If it is not a community that can worship together, on some church's terms, then it is or will increasingly become secular. In Christianity, communities which float free are not viable. There is neither faith nor ecumenism ungrounded in the church."

[29]Mitchell, *op.cit.*, p.139.

[30]George Fletcher, *Loyalty*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993, p.60.

[31]Lash, (1986) *op.cit.*, p55.

[32]Edward Schillebeeckx, *Church : The Human Story of God*, translated by John Bowden, London, SCM, 1990, pp.44, 35.

[33]H-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, translated by Joel Weinsheimer & Donald Marshall. 2d rev. ed., New York, Crossroad, 1989, especially pp.291-297. I am aware that Gadamer's position has been criticised (for example, by Habermas) for being excessively optimistic about the benign role played by tradition. But the fact that a tradition can be critiqued on the ground that it functions on behalf of an ideology, with beneficiaries and those who suffer on its account, does not invalidate my treatment of the notion of 'living tradition', a distinctive form of life (and interpretation) which has the capacity to be open, self-critical, inclusive and to allow for both continuity and change. For two penetrating and balanced studies of Gadamer's work, see the relevant chapters in Joseph Dunne, *Back to the Rough Ground*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1993; and Shaun Gallagher, *Hermeneutics and Education*, New York, State University of New York Press, 1992. I think one can justifiably claim that Blondel (whose work is referred to in 6.3) anticipated (by sixty years) central Gadamerian concerns, although I have found no evidence of any direct influence.

[34]Cf this comment on Gadamer by Terry Veling: "Hermeneutics involves an encounter or dialogue between two sets of prejudices or historical horizons: that of the traditionary text or text analogue with its claims and concerns, and that of the interpreter's own historical situation with its questions and possibilities." Veling, *Living in the Margins*, New York, Crossroad, 1996, p.35. One could ask: "is the text that which is seen or that which permits the seeing to take place?" Sophie Haroutunian-Gordon, in *The Educational Conversation*, edited by J. Garrison and A. Rud, New York, State University of New York Press, p.100. In my treatment of Blondel and living tradition I take the view that a focus on the 'text' of the tradition and a capacity to 'see' more clearly the meaning of one's experience are so intimately related that one cannot have one without the other, even though both the 'text' and one's 'seeing' are vulnerable to distortion.

[35]Gadamer's view "holds much in common with Newman's own theory of how Christian traditions both inform, and are transformed by, the people who commit themselves to them." Thomas Carr, *Newman and Gadamer*, Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press, 1996, p.62.

[36]Gadamer, *op.cit.*, pp. 307-11; 324-41; 373.

[37]Veling, *op.cit.*, pp.40-41; Gadamer, *op.cit.*, 268.

[38]For the influence of Blondel on twentieth century Catholic (especially but not only French) thought see, for example, Aidan Nichols, *From Newman To Congar*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1990, pp.154, 196, 250-1, 253. Yves Congar, *Tradition and the Life of the Church*, London, 1964. Gerald McCool (ed), *A Rahner Reader*, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975, pp.xiv, 73, 259. Henri de Lubac, *At The Service of the Church*, translated byAnne Elizabeth Englund, San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1993, pp.19, 65, 101-2. H. de Lubac (ed), *Maurice Blondel et Auguste Valensin. Correspondance* [in 3 volumes] (Paris, Aubier, 1957-65); *idem.*, (ed) *P.Teilhard de Chardin et Maurice Blondel. Correspondence*, translated by William Whitman (New York, Herder and Herder, 1967); see also P.Teilhard de Chardin, *Lettres Intimes à Auguste Valensin, Bruno de Solage, Henri de Lubac, André Ravier, 1919-1955. Introduction et notes par Henri de Lubac* (Paris, 1974). Henri de Lubac (ed), *Correspondance Blondel-Wehrlé*, Paris, Aubier-Montaigne, 1969 (two volumes). Pierre Gauthier, *Newman et Blondel*, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1988.

[39]Avery Dulles, *Models of Revelation*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1983, p.50.

[40]For this section I develop further J. Sullivan, 'Living Tradition', *The Downside Review*, vol. 105, January 1988, pp.59-66. *Cf.* an earlier treatment of mine, also called 'Living Tradition', *The Tablet*, 23/1/82, pp.80-81, an article which compared Blondel's work on this topic with that of the sociologist Peter Berger, in the latter's *The Heretical Imperative*, London, Collins, 1980.

[41]Maurice Blondel, 'Histoire et Dogme', in *Les Prémiers Écrits de Maurice Blondel*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1956, p.213.

[42]*Ibid.*, p.205.

[43]Blondel, quoted in Dru and Trethowan's introduction to *Letter on Apologetics and History and Dogma*, London, Harvill Press, 1964 (reissued 1995, Edinburgh, T & T Clark), p.215.

[44]*Ibid.*, p.277.

[45]*Ibid.*, p.269.

[46]*Ibid.*, pp.277,279.

[47]*Ibid.*, pp.273-4.

[48]Blondel, *Carnets Intimes*, vol I, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1961, pp.339-40.

[49]Blondel, *Carnets Intimes*, vol II, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1966, p. 279.

[50]*op.cit.*, p.274.

[51]Blondel, *L'Action*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1973, p.413.

[52]*History and Dogma*, p.267. *cf.* de Lubac's comment on tradition as " a propulsive as much as a protective force", quoted in *The Sign We Give*, Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1995, p.29.

[53]Blondel, *Carnets Intimes*, II, p.259.

[54]*Ibid.*, p.158.

[55]*Ibid.*

[56]Blondel, *Exigences Philosophiques du Christianisme*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1950, p. 203.

[57]Blondel -Wehrlé *Correspondance*, op.cit., p.288.

[58]*Ibid.*

[59]*Blondel-Laberthonnière: Correspondance Philosophique*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1961, p.181. Associated other criticisms which Blondel levelled against the church of his time included inferior preaching, claiming a monopoly of grace, debasing the sacramental life, a blunt and crude approach to apologetics and too much emphasis on (and an inappropriate exercise of) the rights and powers of the church. See *Carnets Intimes*, vol. I, p. 219 and vol II, pp.242, 254, 257, 277; also *Blondel-Wehrlé Correspondance*, op.cit., vol II, p.531.

[60]Blondel, *La Philosophie et L'Esprit Chrètien*, vol II, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1946, pp.77-88.

[61]*Ibid.*, p.81.

[62]*Ibid.*, pp.81-2.

[63]*Ibid.*, pp. 81, 83, 84, 87.

[64]For treatments of rationality which broaden our appreciation of its diverse forms, see Paddy Walsh, *Education and Meaning*, London, Cassell, 1993; and Nicholas Maxwell, *From Knowledge to Wisdom*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987.

[65]On such formation, see Paddy Walsh, 'A Jesuit School' a paper given at an International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996; and *Foundations*, compiled by Carl Meirose for the Jesuit Secondary Education Association, Washington, DC, 1994.

[66]See Marie-Jeanne Coutagne (forthcoming), *Maurice Blondel, Professeur*

[67]Matthew 13: 24-30.

[68]Blondel, *Carnets Intimes*, op. cit., vol. II, p.41.

[69]*Ibid.*, pp.282, 290.

[70]*Ibid.*, p.273.

[71]Raymond Saint-Jean, *L'Apologétique philosophique : Blondel 1893 - 1913*, Paris, 1966, p.298.

[72]J.A. Möhler, *Unity in the Church or the principle of Catholicism*, edited and translated by Peter Erb, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of America Press, 1996; J.H. Newman, *The Development of Christian Doctrine*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1960. Following Blondel, apart from tracing the spirit of *aggiornamento* and the notion of the people of God and the call to respond to the issues and questions of the day in the documents of Vatican II, for example, in *Gaudium et Spes*, one can also mention as his disciples, at least in some elements of their thought, Gregory Baum, Yves Congar and Charles Curran. See Baum, *Man Becoming*, New York,

Herder & Herder, 1970; Congar, translated by A.N. Woodrow, *Tradition and the Life of the Church*, London, Burns & Oates, 1964; Curran, *The Living Tradition of Catholic Moral Theology*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.

[73]Blondel, *Carnets Intimes*, vol. II, op.cit., pp.284, 339.

[74]I have drawn heavily in parts of this last section on my article 'Blondel and a Living Tradition for Catholic Education', *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, vol. 1, no. 1, September 1997, pp.67 -76. Since completing this thesis I have been able to benefit from Thomas Groome's substantial chapter on tradition in his book *Educating For Life*, Allen, Texas, Thomas More Press, 1998. In the specific context of Catholic schooling and in the wider context of sound education generally, Groome asks for both critical appreciation and creative appropriation of tradition, activities which imply treating tradition as a great conversation, (an idea which is reminiscent of Oakeshott), one with major implications for the content of and approaches to the curriculum. (See especially pp. 218-221, 231, 242, 256.) Groome suggests (p.218-19) that an appropriation of living tradition in schools will encourage teachers to attempt a balancing act in the curriculum between the disciplines of learning (building on the past), the experience of learners (open to their present interests) and the needs of society (seeking to construct a better future).

CHAPTER SEVEN

Catholic Schools and the Common Good

In the previous chapters I have argued that there is a distinctive Catholic approach to education, one that is substantive, comprehensive and integrated. The worldview it is based on and the priorities which emerge from its educational philosophy are contestable, held by a minority of citizens and conflict, in some respects at least, with views widely shared among the public at large. Unless Catholics can show that their desire for a distinctive form of education is not vulnerable to accusations of being inward-looking, isolationist and unconcerned about the common good, their schools will neither deserve nor attract the support of a wider society.

Yet, if one extreme to be avoided is the kind of emphasis on distinctiveness that leads to exclusiveness, there is also an inverse difficulty for Catholic schools. Too great a concern to display inclusiveness might leave Catholic schools open to the criticism that they merely duplicate 'secular' schools and do not warrant special support, funding or legal protection from the state, nor continuing self-sacrifice from the Catholic community itself. A balance has to be struck, where it can be shown that Catholic schools combine distinctiveness with belonging to the wider community and promoting the common good. This will entail displaying all the positive and humane values which are jointly accepted by society and the church, for example, equal opportunities, due process and those features of inclusiveness which were outlined in chapter five. Far from being inward-looking, Catholic schools aim to develop in pupils the desire and ability to contribute constructively to worldly affairs simultaneously with their readiness to respond to the call to conversion and to perfection. Such a positive contribution entails not only a willingness to give

themselves wholeheartedly and energetically to the common tasks of safeguarding human welfare, but also the capacity to criticize prophetically prevailing priorities and power structures where these seem misguided and undermining of the common good. [1] In this chapter I intend to show that a concern for the common good is an integral feature of a Catholic philosophy of education and that Catholic schools can be shown to contribute to this common good.

As an acknowledgement of the contested nature of Catholic education, I consider first in this chapter a range of possible objections to the existence of separate church schools in contemporary society. Secondly, I explore how a particular understanding of the relationship between church and world provides a foundation for a positive approach to the issue in question here, namely whether separate Catholic schools can be justified in a pluralist society. Thirdly, I provide an exposition of a Catholic understanding of the notion of the common good. Fourthly, I show how Catholic schools can contribute to the common good.

7.1. Catholic schools & contemporary society: some concerns

The continuing existence of - and, as in the UK, state support for - separate Catholic schools within a multi-cultural and multi-faith society is open to several possible objections. Such objections might be categorised as economic, social, political and educational. Two other types of objections could also be considered, for example, first, the claim that the maintenance of separate Catholic schools fails to give due priority to the ecumenical imperative, and, second, the claim that alternative pastoral strategies for the Catholic faith community would serve it better.[2] All of these objections deserve careful consideration, but I treat them only briefly here because my main concern is to clear the ground for the construction (later in the chapter) of a case

for the continued existence of separate Catholic schools in the context of a pluralist society, a case which is sufficiently broadly based to merit the attention of those who are not 'insiders' to Catholicism.

Even though the Catholic community in England and Wales is still expected to pay what amounts to a substantial additional levy for its denominational schools, these are nevertheless very heavily supported from public funds, through taxation.[3] On economic grounds a complaint could be made that the existence of the dual system unnecessarily complicates the overall provision of schooling, leading in some areas to duplication of provision (which is a burden to the economy), or to prolonged wrangling over the allocation of school places. Resource management of the education system could be streamlined if no account had to be taken of the different demands of particular minority groups for separate schooling.

On social grounds it might be argued that the existence of separate Catholic schools unnecessarily reinforces existing divisions within society, exaggerates the differences between people, reduces the level of mutual understanding and thereby undermines social cohesion.[4] Support for church schools could be interpreted as anachronistic, perpetuating the social influence of the established churches at the expense of many other types of churches, in a way that is out of proportion to the real number of their adherents. Because the admission policies of many church schools require evidence of church affiliation and attendance, it might be argued that the demand for places in some areas leads to spurious claims to religious belonging, which work to the disadvantage of those who are already socially disenfranchised.[5] Pupils who could benefit most from church schools are thereby prevented from enjoying such features as small, homogeneous communities, the use of more traditional teaching styles, high

standards of behaviour and the confident advocacy of more traditional virtues and values.

Concerns about the social effects of separate schooling lead in some cases to political anxieties. I pick out four examples of potential political concerns. First, one might focus on the justification for allowing certain privileges to (mainly) Catholics and Anglicans but refusing other groups the right to set up their own schools with support from the public purse. Evidence of inequality of treatment might lead to loss of faith in the just distribution of goods provided by our political system. Second, it could be argued that the existence of a plural system of schools (taking into account the independent sector as well as the church school sector) undermines the effectiveness of a consistent and nationwide approach to schooling, siphons off from the state sector the support of some parents, reduces the quality of education provided and thereby disadvantages the nation in comparison with its competitors. Third, it might be asked if the concern for separate schooling indicates a withdrawal from rather than a full involvement in society? Does the emphasis on discipleship in church schools undermine the development of citizenship? Fourth, if, in an effort to be even-handed, the state were to concede more minority faith-groups the right to run their own schools, with public funding, would this lead to social fragmentation and increased political turmoil?[6]

On educational grounds Catholic schools might be criticised for neglecting the development of pupils' autonomy and exercise of free choice, for being open to indoctrination, for giving inadequate attention to pupils' rights in relation to their parents, for allowing a distortion of the curriculum towards religious perspectives, for failing to contribute to mutual understanding and for being insufficiently inclusive. Other possible criticisms might be the inculcation of an unhealthy sense of guilt (as a

consequence of emphasising sin and the need for forgiveness), a failure to attend to the differing spiritual needs of pupils, (through assuming too readily that they all share the same faith), undue reverence for traditional authority and the past, instead of an openness to the questions, insights and needs of the present, and in the school's treatment of religious, spiritual and moral development, too close an intertwining of these three aspects of personal growth, which would be potentially damaging to pupils, if the differences between them were not respected. A further criticism on educational grounds might be that Catholic schools, in their ideology at least, if not in their actual practice, expect too much of the teacher-pupil relationship, with the teacher required to be a moral exemplar and model of faith and casting young people more in the role of disciples than of pupils or students.[7] My treatment of inclusiveness and of living tradition in Catholic schools in chapters five and six sought to show that such dangers could be avoided and these particular criticisms met.

7.2. Church-world relationship

A Catholic understanding of the relationship between church and world underpins the desire to maintain both the distinctive and the inclusive dimensions of Catholic education. In addition, it provides a basis for ensuring that such inclusiveness is not only a feature within Catholic schools, in the various senses outlined in chapter five, but also that such inclusiveness is expressed as an openness to the world which embraces the promotion of the common good of society as a whole. It follows from a Catholic understanding of the church-world relation that Catholic schools should have it as a major goal to equip their pupils with the knowledge, skills and motivation to contribute to the societies of which they are members.

An understanding of the relationship between the church and the world is itself drawn from an understanding of the relationship between sacred and secular, between divine and human. This was explored in chapter four. From this it follows that there is an essential *compatibility* between church and world, since, from the perspective of faith, God is never absent from creation. God is its source, sustainer, redeemer and goal. However, the word 'redeemer' itself warns us against too easy an *identification* of church and world.[8] It should also remind us not to identify too readily church and kingdom.[9] Both church and world are called to ceaseless conversion, to grow ever more fully into the stature of the children of God; neither have 'arrived'; the process of transformation must penetrate all aspects of our actions, feelings and thoughts, as well as our communities and their institutions and practices. If, from the point of view of faith, the church believes herself to have received irrevocably the communication of God's message, this does not exhaust the scope of God's Holy Spirit or restrict Her operations to the church.[10] The church still has to 'receive' more deeply the implications of God's saving message and still has to grow more fully into both the kind of society (in its community aspect) and into the kind of people (as individuals) that God is calling for. Some of the 'lessons' will come from 'outside' the church, for God is working throughout the world as well as from within the church itself.[11]

For much of the nineteenth century there was antagonism between the two ideologies of Catholicism and liberalism.[12] Various elements contributed to the body of liberal views, not all of which were equally represented in all forms of liberalism: a desire for "parliamentary government, regular elections, a free press, an independent judiciary, separation of church and state", together with a belief that "progress, leading to final perfection, could be achieved by means of free institutions".[13] Perhaps one can speak of liberalism as a 'family' of ideas, which embrace, in different combinations, "a

political programme, an economic outlook, a view of human nature, a social theory, an ethics, an epistemology, even a metaphysics".[14]

Weaknesses in liberalism are recognized from within the western liberal community itself. The rise of communitarianism is testimony to perceived shortcomings: too much emphasis on the individual at the expense of the community, too much emphasis on rights, to the neglect of corresponding duties, self-absorption, too cavalier a response to novelty with an inadequate attention given to continuity, a failure to generate sufficient loyalty and public-spiritedness to foster genuine community, reckless and conspicuous consumption because of an ineffective sense of restraint or of limits, and a debilitating denigration of the authority and necessary demands of moral principles.[15]

Weaknesses in their own position have also been accepted by many Catholics. Nineteenth century triumphant apologetics, militant isolationism, ultra-orthodox sectarianism, refusal to allow any accommodation, adaptation or innovation are not advocated by mainstream Catholicism today. Vatican II's *Gaudium et Spes* displays a much more positive attitude: the church has not only something to teach and to give the modern world; it has something to learn and to receive as well.[16] The modern world is not to be demonized any more than it is to be deified. Such a change of emphasis, which amounts to a rapprochement with the modern world, as well as an *aggiornamento* or renewal of the church itself, has been strengthened by several factors. These include the decline of neo-scholasticism as the prevailing form of Catholic philosophy, an appropriation of insights from historical, biblical, psychological and social studies, an engagement with secular city theology and the development of political and liberation theology. In addition there has been a fresh articulation of Catholic social teaching and a new confidence in commentary on public

affairs relating to a range of issues, for example, nuclear weapons, overseas aid, the importance of housing and family policies, immigration, the plight of refugees, the depiction of violence and sex in the media and the operations of the economy.[17]

In the nineteenth century the Catholic church retreated in the face of revolutionary movements, the process of secularisation and the growing power of nation states. She adopted, sometimes in the face of persecution or in response to hostile legislation, an oppositional and isolationist stance in her relationship to the world, fearing that any adaptation would lead, via dilution and indifference, to assimilation to and then elimination by the world.[18] Every effort was made to ensure that, in the face of an increasing diversity within society, the church presented itself not only as universal, but as uniform.

Adaptations became necessary during the twentieth century because of cultural changes, leading to a different understanding and new expression of the faith. As already described in chapter two, the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) gave legitimacy to a new emphasis in the church's stance toward the world, so that the language became much more positive, with the tone being suggested by terms such as 'invite', 'encourage', 'promote', 'respect' and 'dialogue'.[19] Accompanying this move away from isolation, the institutional church appears to have displayed a much more positive attitude, one of greater humility, openness, desire to show involvement and willingness to take risks.[20]

In the first article of its Constitution on the Church, the Second Vatican Council declared that by virtue of its relationship with Christ, "the Church is a kind of sacrament of intimate union with God and of the unity of all mankind; that is, she is a sign and instrument of such union and unity."[21] Associated with the notion of the

church as sacrament is the view that it mediates God's grace in a symbolic way, making available for us what is otherwise inaudible, intangible and invisible. This does not entail the view that, outside such a body, God does not communicate, offer grace or redeem the world. God cannot, for a believer, be confined in any way. However, our appreciation of God's ways can be focused and made more vivid by an understanding of the mediating role of sacramental experiences.

This mediating or bridge-building role of the church belongs to it as part of its nature as an *interim* body, which should neither be too closely identified with the world nor with the idea of the Kingdom of God. Too close an identification with the Kingdom might lead to isolation and elitism. Too close an identification with the world might lead to so many compromises that contamination is a result. As the Brazilian theologian Leonardo Boff puts it: "ecclesiological health depends on the right relationship between Kingdom-world-Church."[22] The church must take institutional realities into account, both their positive and their negative features, in order that its central messages can be heard and welcomed, rather than merely imposed. This calls for a way of relating to the world which neither automatically legitimates established political regimes nor automatically calls them in question. The church must not be reduced to focusing on merely temporal concerns; but they must not be ignored either. The Kingdom of God, as taught by Jesus, has been inaugurated but it has not yet reached completion. The church as an interim body is to bring into focus, in a distinctive or pre-eminent way, the work to be done in between the 'already' and the 'not yet' of this Kingdom.

The church's move, from an oppositional stance to a more positive reading of the world and a call for greater involvement in its concerns, is closely connected to a growing acceptance by the church that both limited government and constitutional

democracy are beneficial to society. *Gaudium et Spes* is at pains to argue that the state

> must take care not to put obstacles in the way of family or cultural groups, or of organizations and intermediate institutions...Citizens...should take care not to vest too much power in the hands of public authority nor to make untimely and exaggerated demands for favours and subsidies.[23]

Kenneth Grasso, a political scientist, has recently commented on what he calls the church's "preferential option for constitutional democracy" and he identifies six features of this preference: [1] human rights; [2] limited government; [3] subsidiarity; [4] freedom; [5] "constitutions specifying the scope of government and the rights of individuals"; [6] "opportunities to play an active part...in the political community".[24]

The acceptance by the church of limited government and constitutional democracy is related both to a prudential response to historical developments and to an appreciation of the implications of traditional Catholic social teaching, whose key concepts, some of which are original to the church, include (a) the notion of the common good, (b) the dignity of the human person, (c) natural law, (d) subsidiarity and (e) solidarity.[25] It has to be admitted that popes in this century have warmed to democracy and the notion of human rights not only because of the internal logic of their own tradition but also in the face of totalitarian regimes and a massive increase in the powers available to the state (of whatever political persuasion), powers which have threatened Catholic communities. The pragmatism of the papal response does not, however, contradict its principled rationale; the papal reading of political realities and their attendant rights and duties is drawn from a perspective which envisages a transcendent point of reference for society, with supernatural destiny as the goal of humanity. Such a teleology tends to relativise the importance of purely political considerations and suggests the necessity of separating spiritual and temporal authority and roles.

The American Jesuit, John Courtney Murray, has been credited with influencing significantly the Catholic church's change of emphasis with regard to the secular world during the period immediately prior to and throughout the Second Vatican Council, especially in relation to freedom of conscience.[26] Many of Murray's themes were to permeate key texts of the Council: the 'compenetration' of Church and world, the eschatological character of Christian existence, which looks to the future, the coming-to-be of the Kingdom, the distinction between classical and historical consciousness (an idea which Murray had borrowed from Lonergan and integrated into his political theology), the dialectic between freedom and authority, the mutual need of the individual and the community for each other, the church's call to service, the requirement that the church remain a visible community.[27] I will comment on two of these points which are relevant to the development of my argument.

Firstly, Murray clarified how authority is needed for freedom to flourish. Its purpose is not to be self-serving but to enable freedom to grow healthily. He considered that a creative tension between freedom and authority is inevitable and that each is open to distortion. His view was that authority does not "stand *over* the community as a power to decide and command' but rather that it 'stands *within* the community, as a ministry to be performed in the service of the community."[28] The church should witness through service; by meeting needs it should seek to draw all into the ambience of the kingdom, the communion of love, to "gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad" (John 11:52). Such missionary work requires from the church some preservation, but it will be a preservation without possessiveness, a treasury of truth held in trust without a turning inward. This will involve a combination of reverence for the past and an openness to the concerns of today.

Secondly, the visibility of the church in society which Murray called for is intended not for the sake of self-aggrandisement or for worldly status. It is required instead in order that the source of salvation be acknowledged and properly responded to, with no delusions about the costs of commitment and no disguising the conflicts both internal to self and within society that will be entailed in accepting. Murray wanted to ensure "that the work done is the work of the Church", rather than some mere human construct which bends too readily to the whims of the world.[29] In this way the cutting edge of truth would be felt. The visibility of the church as an organization within society is necessary, according to Murray, "both for the sake of its own unity as an interpersonal communion and also for the sake of its action in history."[30] This visibility implies that distinctiveness is to be maintained so that authority can exercise a corrective function necessitated by our sinful tendencies.

In a book published while the Second Vatican Council was still meeting, Murray made another distinction which casts light on the attempt within Catholic education to be both distinctive and inclusive. This was the distinction between evangelism and proselytism. This distinction reflects the boundary between the legitimate influence of the church in society and its unwarranted interference. The difference between evangelism and proselytism is less to do with the final goal intended than with the style and spirit which can be discerned in the activity. Among the characteristics of proselytism Murray identified "self-assertive aggressiveness,...language or action offensive to the religious sensibilities of the community; the employment of means of seduction...Proselytism does not stand at the door and knock; it rushes rudely into the house."[31] Like those who proselytise, evangelists will also aim for conversion by communicating the gospel, but they will be less domineering or concerned for 'conquest', they will display a gentler and more patient spirit, being more open to the

work of the Spirit, more respectful of the dignity of the individual and more sensitive to the needs of those with whom they enter into dialogue.

The attempt to combine distinctiveness with inclusiveness in Catholic schools can be assisted by drawing on several of Murray's points, even if some of them have to be developed further in ways which he did not envisage.[32] For the purposes of this chapter, however, his main contribution is to challenge the church to take a responsible public role in society, for the sake of truth, to offer service, to promote the common good, and to prevent the state from exercising an excessive influence over matters where it is not best placed to pronounce with authority, for example, marriage, the family, the relation between parents and children and the realm of education.

7.3. Catholic understanding of the common good

The notion of the common good, as taught within the Catholic tradition, has a lengthy history. It draws upon both classical (especially Aristotelian) and scriptural roots.[33] I take the broad meaning of the phrase the 'common good' to refer to "the sum total of those conditions of social living, whereby men are enabled more fully and more readily to achieve their own perfection".[34] An understanding of the common good is not one that the church arrives at ready-made, complete and applicable thereafter to all times and situations. What is assumed to be the common good will be dependent on an understanding of many things: human nature, the possibilities and constraints afforded by the level of our scientific 'reading' of and technological capacity to 'manage' the world around us, the possible elements required for individual and social flourishing, the available values which can be realised and the potential threats against which we should guard ourselves. For example, earlier twentieth century Catholic

defences of the common good were directed against totalitarian belief systems such as communism and fascism, which completely subordinated the individual to the needs of the collective.

Jacques Maritain, who dominated the intellectual scene of Catholic philosophical commentary on social and political issues for more than thirty years across the middle of this century, had in view especially these totalitarian threats to faith and humanity, as well as the apparently less extreme but equally insidious threats from liberal, materialist capitalism. One kind of threat over-valued the collective and destroyed the basis of responsible individuality; the other over-valued individualism and neglected the common good.

In *The Person and the Common Good* Maritain showed that there is no real conflict between what is good for society and what is good for individuals.[35] Between the person and the common good we should envisage not an opposition but rather "a reciprocal subordination and mutual implication".[36] Because of the twin threats, first the ambition of totalitarian politics to control all aspects of life and to form persons in such a way as to rob them of their rightful freedom, and second the exaltation of a shallow individuality and an indisciplined free choice within the liberal West, Maritain was concerned to protect the priority of religious values from social interference. Some of the most important aspects of our nature, Maritain believed, transcend political society, and therefore should be free from undue state influence.[37] "Man is constituted a person, made for God and life eternal, before he is constituted a part of the city".[38]

It would be in keeping with Maritain's general view to claim that totalitarian regimes sought deliberately to destroy parental responsibility and authority as potential threats

to the state, while liberal capitalism (more benignly) neglected and undermined such responsibility and authority by exalting individualism. His emphasis on the importance of the family, both as a contributing factor in serving the common good and as an element in human flourishing, is closely related to the development of the notion of subsidiarity, which I examine below. According to Maritain, the notion of the common good serves to protect individuals and yet it also exacts from them the price of responsible cooperation. Crucially, the domain of religion must not be subordinated to the priorities of the state.

The notion of the common good has recently become the focus of both scholarly and public debate.[39] The most recent authoritative, if brief, statement of the Catholic Church's position on the common good in this country is that issued in the autumn of 1996 by the Bishops of England and Wales.[40] I will take this document as a significant indication of the (English and Welsh) Catholic Church's position on the common good, even though it does not do more than hint at the implications for education of the principles which are enunciated there.[41]

The common good is defined as "the whole network of social conditions which enable human individuals and groups to flourish and live a fully human life, otherwise described as 'integral human development'".[42] Underpinning the understanding of the common good which pervades this document there are two particular ideas which are given prominence: these are subsidiarity and solidarity. "If subsidiarity is the principle behind the organisation of societies from a vertical perspective, solidarity is the equivalent horizontal principle."[43] Central to subsidiarity is the desire to disperse authority and to foster the healthy development of a range of institutions and communities which serve as intermediary bodies between the state and individuals.[44]

The classic definition and assertion of subsidiarity upon which the bishops draw is that of Pope Pius XI:

> Just as it is gravely wrong to take from individuals what they can accomplish by their own initiative and industry and give it to the community, so also it is an injustice and at the same time a grave evil and disturbance of right order to assign to a greater or higher association what lesser and subordinate organisations can do.[45]

Solidarity, on the other hand, is meant to indicate the virtue of acting in the light of our mutual responsibility for one another. It underlines our interdependence. Far from reducing morality to a private, simple or sentimental response, it engages with the complexity of the systems in which we are all enmeshed, economic, cultural, political and religious.[46] Subsidiarity and solidarity are seen to be intimately related, each serving the common good, although in different ways.[47] Subsidiarity should serve to protect and to promote the particular and the local interests of intermediary bodies, while solidarity should ensure that such interests do not lead to excessive narrowness of concern, fragmentation, division, lack of cohesion or a denial of those features of our existence which we hold in common.[48]

There will be some tension between these two, for if a concern to protect subsidiarity is carried too far by any group, this will undermine the concerted decision-making and action by representatives of the whole community. In such circumstances the group might adopt a counter-cultural mode of relating to the wider society. This has sometimes been the stance adopted in secular societies by the Catholic Church. If little room is left for the operation of subsidiarity because of a too dominant pressure to institutionalise and promote solidarity through collective action, there is a danger that local communities and groups will be stifled, over-dependent on the state, prevented from exercising initiative and forced to confine the practice of their

traditions to the private and domestic domain, which would emasculate entirely their claims to offer something of public significance, even to those who are not adherents.

Subsidiarity and solidarity are closely associated, in the minds of the bishops, with other basic principles or emphases: the importance of listening to ideas from others, natural law, the 'option for the poor' and the importance of recognizing our social responsibilities.[49] This last is given a broad interpretation:

> Christ taught us that our neighbourhood is universal: so loving our neighbour has global dimensions. It demands fair international trading policies, decent treatment of refugees, support for the UN and control of the arms trade. Solidarity with our neighbour is also about the promotion of equality of rights and equality of opportunities.[50]

The Bishops stress that democracy depends on common values and an understanding of the common good. They deplore the ceaseless amplification of claims to rights in the name of an autonomy which operates without limits and in a vacuum. Instead, they emphasize, human rights derive from the nature of the human person made in the image of God.[51] They go on to apply these principles to the market place, social services, the mass media, the world of work, Europe, the global common good, the environment, ownership and property, with a recognition of the multiplicity of roles we play:

> [a] manager in one enterprise may be the consumer in another, the neighbour of a third, the supplier of a fourth, a shareholder in a fifth; and may subsequently become a redundant ex-employee, the victim of the very policies that as a manager he or she may have helped to create.[52]

There are both advantages and drawbacks in relying on religiously based arguments for the defence of human rights and the promotion of the common good. A religious context for such arguments might provide for adherents of a faith some motivation

and resources (in the form of guidance and discipline from the ecclesial community) in addition to that enjoyed by people outside such communities. However, if the grounds for defending rights and promoting the common good cannot be shared with 'outsiders' this can lead to difficulties in communication, in mutual trust and understanding, and in the willingness to engage in joint action. It is my intention in the next section to construct a case for Catholic schools that rests, to a large degree, on evidence or arguments which do not derive their plausibility from acceptance of the Catholic worldview described in chapter four.

7.4. Catholic Schools and the Common Good

In the preceding analysis of the Catholic understanding of the common good I have not drawn out sufficiently clearly the strong emphasis in Catholic thought on justice, the option for the poor and respect for the dignity and freedom of the individual.[53] These principles must be demonstrated *within* Catholic schools if advocates of separate church schools are to have any credibility. Such demonstration has not always been apparent.[54] But I have indicated that the notion of the common good has an important place in Catholic thinking and that it has a wide application.[55] Far from wanting faith to be treated as a private affair, it is central to Catholic teaching that alongside spiritual values and moral teaching, scripture reading and study, personal prayer and collective worship, Catholic education should have social and civic functions, that it should contribute to the development of the qualities necessary for citizenship and that a broad and practical concern for the needs of others will be promoted within schools and society.[56] Even if the Catholic notion of the common good does not fully convince others, there may well be sufficient consensus, on non-religious grounds, about what is required for this good, to enable the argument that Catholic schools contribute positively to the common good to be taken seriously.

There are seven strands to the argument that Catholic schools contribute to the common good. These seven strands can be divided into three broad categories: the first three focus on the outcomes and popularity of Catholic schools; the second three are concerned with the 'safeguarding' role of Catholic schools - that is, safeguards from undue state influence, from defects in liberal education and from being closed to the possibility of the transcendent; while the final strand is based on the notion of Catholic schools as 'constitutive communities'. *It is not essential to my case that each* strand will on its own withstand the strain of opposition or that it will pull waverers into the camp of the committed. But I believe that, when taken together, the seven strands I pick out jointly comprise a sufficiently cogent argument (in 'secular' terms) that the potential contribution of Catholic schools to the common good significantly outweighs any possible disadvantages of denominational education.

7.4.1 Outcomes and Popularity

The first three of the seven strands to this argument would need to rely mainly on empirical evidence. *Since this is not an empirical study I can only hint at what would* have to be established, if these strands were to be developed. First, there would be the argument that Catholic schools meet the educational standards required by society (through its elected representatives) at least as well as if not more successfully than other schools. This would involve taking into account the catchment area, intake, resources and the academic progress made by pupils in their passage through the school.

It is not part of the Catholic case for separate school provision that their schools should tolerate educational standards lower than those laid down for all schools, on

the grounds that they claim to offer something different from these other schools. The Catholic community does not dispute the appropriateness of the curriculum requirements or the academic standards expected of all schools, though it does wish to supplement them, to place them in a broader context and, in some cases, to modify or to realign the priorities among them, for example, to give more importance to preparing for life than to earning a living, and to bring out the essential interconnections, as seen from a faith perspective, between the moral, the spiritual and the religious dimensions of life.

There is substantial agreement in the Catholic community on the study skills, areas of learning and attainment targets which are expected in 'common' schools. Catholics ask for the right to go beyond this in their own schools. This 'going beyond', however, neither contradicts nor distracts from the substance of these academic expectations. It does cast them in a different light, in particular by viewing academic effort as part of the realization of our God-given talents, as an element in our response to God's call and as an integral part of a more deep-seated striving for perfection.

If Catholic schools could be shown to have failed to promote educational standards this would count as a major obstacle to acceptance of their claim to be promoting the common good. I believe that there is evidence available which supports the claim that Catholic schools in general do meet or even exceed the educational standards expected of mainstream schools. Such evidence comes from various sources: from OFSTED, local education authority and diocesan inspection reports, from patterns of parental choice of schools for their children and from independent academic researchers, both in this country and in others where separate Catholic schooling is provided.[57]

It should be noted that my claim is not that a Catholic school which ensures that its pupils succeed academically is *ipso facto* a good *Catholic* school. Other features would be looked for before this judgement could be made. My claim is, rather, that a Catholic school which did not ensure that its pupils made significant academic progress would be a poor school by Catholic as well as according to secular criteria. Furthermore, such academic progress is to be expected of all pupils, including those who suffer economic or social disadvantages. English, American and Australian research suggests that Catholic schools enable such pupils to make greater progress than they usually achieve in 'common' schools.[58]

The second strand in the argument that Catholic schools contribute to the common good would be evidence that they promote among their pupils a high level of concern and competence in moral and social issues, a sense of responsibility, a willingness and a capacity to contribute to public life and citizenship. For example, if a concern for justice and peace, for human rights and freedom, for the protection of the environment and conservation of the habitat of other creatures were marked features of the behaviour of those who attended Catholic schools, this would be relevant evidence. The gathering and analysis of such evidence would require a large-scale and longitudinal survey, one which is beyond the scope of this thesis. But, in principle, if it could be shown that pupils emerging from Catholic schools did not display a high level of awareness and understanding of a broad range of moral and social issues together with the ability to act constructively on such awareness, the claim that they promote the common good would be seriously weakened.[59]

It should be noted that this strand of the overall claim on behalf of Catholic schools only requires evidence that they promote at least as high a level of awareness and competence in moral and social affairs as that shown by the products of other schools.

My claim here is not the major one that Catholic schools contribute more than others to the common good, but the lesser one that they can be shown to contribute to this good in sufficiently numerous, diverse and significant ways that those who seek to defend them can justifiably declare that the objections levelled earlier in this chapter, far from being overwhelming, can, in principle at least, be satisfactorily answered.[60]

A third part of the defence of Catholic schools in the context of a pluralist society is that they meet the wishes of very many parents that their children's education should be based on their own beliefs and values. This strand of the argument does not rest entirely on empirical grounds. There are two reasons for this. First, the principle that parents are to be acknowledged as the first and foremost educators of their children is absolutely central to Catholic teaching on education.[61] Second, the respect to be given to parental wishes and rights is considered an aspect of the principle of subsidiarity. This was examined in 7.3; it is also applied to the defence of separate church schools in the fourth strand of my argument.

It is very difficult for the state to adopt a neutral stance with regard to parental wishes regarding their children's upbringing. Either the state supports the provision of education according to parental wishes or it ends up by obstructing such education through the provision of schools which may claim in principle to be neutral (or blind to differences) but which in practice not only ignore these wishes but are actually perceived by some faith communities as hostile to and corrosive of them.[62] Other things being equal, (for example, concerns about costs or about educational standards), and provided that the provision of denominational education does not undermine the ends of education sought by others of a different persuasion in other schools or lead to other schools being disadvantaged, one can claim that the satisfying of parental wishes is a good in itself.

Catholic families reflect the reduction in the birth rate shown by the rest of the population. Overt religious 'practice' in many Catholic families is considerably less than a quarter of a century ago.[63] Despite these facts, there is evidence that a higher proportion of children who have been baptised as Catholics are attending church schools than was the case twenty five years ago, that Catholic schools suffer much less from falling rolls than other schools, and that an increasing percentage of parents who are not Catholics want their children to attend church schools.

These parallel increases, in the proportion of baptised Catholic children attending church schools and in the proportion of non-Catholic pupils who attend these schools, are quite compatible. With a few exceptions, it appears that provision for Catholic schools has not historically matched the demand for places.[64] Now, from within the reduced overall size of the 'practising' Catholic community, church schools continue to be popular in most areas, even though the sense of there being a moral duty to send children from Catholic homes to church schools seems much less marked than hitherto. It could be argued then that continued parental support for church schools, even if from parents who 'practise' their faith in other ways less fervently, indicates a more deliberate and individual choice than when attendance at church schools was a cultural norm within the Catholic community.

Two conclusions might reasonably be drawn from a situation where there is increasing pressure on pupil admissions in Catholic schools exerted by parents from other Christian denominations, from other religious faiths and from non-religious backgrounds. The stronger conclusion might be that Catholic schools satisfy parental wishes for a congenial educational ethos more fully than is the case in many county schools. Alternatively, and expressed more weakly, even if such parents really desire

a form of education which is not exactly the same as that provided within Catholic schools, their wishes are frustrated more often in county schools, which many find less attractive environments for the upbringing of their children.[65]

7.4.2 Safeguarding role of Catholic schools

A fourth strand of the defence of separate Catholic schools relies on the principle of subsidiarity described in 7.3[66] The relative autonomy of their schools is seen by Catholics as an expression of subsidiarity, whereby 'intermediate' communities exercise initiative in areas where they have competence and a direct interest. According to Catholic teaching, this application of subsidiarity to schools helps to limit the incursion of intrusive governments and it functions as an enabling condition for human flourishing, facilitating individual growth, healthy community life, responsible choice and scope for creativity.

Two comments might be made here about subsidiarity. First, the principle of subsidiarity, although advocated as an important element in Catholic social thinking, does not depend on belief in revelation, and its employment entails neither acceptance of the church's magisterium nor reliance on any of its theological presuppositions. In a sense it could be said to be a purely secular principle of social organisation, derived from human experience, accessible to reason and open to believers and unbelievers alike, even if, as a principle, it can be additionally buttressed by religious beliefs about the human propensity to sin and the salvific mission of the church.[67] Second, there is some tension between the church's advocacy of subsidiarity as a general principle to be employed in social and political affairs and the centralising tendency displayed in the exercise of authority within the church itself.

As a result, where the Catholic church is a leading exponent of the argument for subsidiarity, and in so far as the principle is seriously compromised by the church's own practice in 'internal' affairs, its advocacy in the school context lacks conviction.[68] This does not mean, however, that the principle itself is invalid. It does present a twin challenge to the church: on the one hand , to demonstrate greater integrity and consistency in applying the principle within church organisations, including dioceses, parishes and within schools themselves; on the other hand, to strive more energetically to engage in dialogue with others and to communicate the nature and scope of the claim for subsidiarity more effectively in the public forum.

A fifth strand in the separate schools case draws on a cluster of ideas which rely on a more general religious perspective, one which goes beyond the scope usually allowed by a liberal education. This cluster of ideas could be shared with people from a variety of religious and moral stances. It does not depend directly on Catholic principles. From the perspective of many religions and also from the perspective of some forms of moral philosophy there are possible dangers to the common good which might arise from current forms of liberal education. Such dangers might include too subjective a view of morality, too anthropological a view of nature, too narrow a view of rationality, and too optimistic a view of human capacities.

To guard against these dangers, it might be argued that at least some schools in society should maintain a stance which is explicitly open to the possibility of receiving revelation and which displays a reverence for the 'givenness' of nature, a search for the 'discovery' (rather than the 'construction') of (objective) morality, and a realistic recognition of the proneness of the human will to self-deception and evil. This cluster of ideas modifies and perhaps constrains the promotion of critical and independent thinking encouraged within liberal education, but it does not contradict such thinking.

It seeks to serve the common good by a more realistic acknowledgement of the dialectic between development and discipline which I outlined in chapter four as an essential feature of human nature.

By extension of the fifth strand we are led into the sixth, which also relies on a faith perspective: the acknowledgement of a transcendent point of reference for society with an accompanying sense of accountability to a higher source of authority than that supplied by the state or even by international bodies such as the United Nations Organisation. Such a view suggests that the state is not self-sufficient, and it encourages the state to be more humble in its aspirations and more self-limiting in its actions.

On the one hand, acceptance of God as the transcendent point of reference should prompt in us a receptivity to resources beyond our 'normal' capacity (in Christian terms, grace). This is related to the point in my fifth strand about the 'givenness' of nature, for such a view implies that nature as 'gift' (understood to embrace the 'new' nature offered in the baptism, forgiveness, conversion and transformation implied by a life open to God's call) is the source of our interrelated salvation, not nature as 'grasped' in a self-propelled journey in search for individual happiness.

On the other hand, acceptance of God as the reference point for society gives us a reason not to enforce all the goodness we can. This is due to the belief that the state is not the supreme authority, that we are riddled with the very weaknesses we seek to eradicate in others, (and therefore we must be wary of setting ourselves up in judgement over them,) and that we do not have an adequate understanding of God's purposes and ways. Such a view relativises our temporal ambitions and priorities. For it sees a connection between 'soulcraft' and statecraft, between the formation and

transformation of our spiritual and moral development and the art of politics, social policy and community building. Acceptance of God as supreme authority and as guide to true life reminds us of the need to address dimensions of our nature and calling other than (and alongside) the social and political, for each of us is envisaged as a 'project' of ultimate and eternal significance, a project to be pursued together with and on behalf of others.

If, in this scheme of things, all are of eternal significance, none can be sacrificed for the sake of the collective. The 'relativising' of the importance of the state might be argued to be one weapon in defence of the sacred dignity of the individual. This is one form of contribution to the common good supplied by schools which proclaim the *authority of God over our lives. And if we are made more conscious of the futility* and destructiveness of a selfish individualism and if we are more fully aware of both the attractiveness and the cost of commitment through the education and formation provided by such schools, then we shall be enabled to see, beyond the limitations of individualism, how the 'demands' of love require that our priorities and actions are modified by discipline, sustained by sound habits and facilitated by a supportive culture.[69]

7.4.3 'Constitutive' communities

The seventh strand to my argument is based on the role of the church school as a 'constitutive' community, one which provides for its pupils a concrete example of the burdens and benefits and the conditions and processes involved in community life. A 'constitutive' community is one that is identity-building.[70] It is fundamental to our self-description. It provides the narrative which initially and provisionally makes sense of our lives, telling us where we have come from, who we belong to and where we

are headed.[71] It provides the moral 'building blocks' and training for the development of personal qualities which form the basis of our character. In the minds of those who participate in such constitutive communities there will be a close association between community, culture, character and conscience. Memory, membership and responsibility will be integrally related, although this does not entail any neglect of critical thinking, imagination and creativity, all of which are also needed to enable pupils to transcend the limitations of memory and membership.[72]

This seventh strand of my argument assumes that the 'thin' view of the good allowed by liberal education pays insufficient attention to the need for identity to be fostered and to the part played in our development by both memory and membership.[73] At the same time as failing to recognise the necessity of both memory and membership as conditions which facilitate the growth of a sturdy independence and sense of responsibility, such a 'thin' view exaggerates their limitations, treating cultural attachment as potentially imprisoning.[74] While the concern not to over-determine the direction of someone's life must be shared by advocates of a 'thicker' view of life such as Catholicism, since this concern is required by their own principles about the dignity and essential freedom of the human person, they will wish to ensure that the necessary 'space' needed for individual initiative and choice does not become empty.[75]

Through her schools the church aims to foster both the institutions and the personal values which support and sustain liberty.[76] The two are intimately connected, for persons and their individual 'life-plans' do not emerge from a vacuum. Pupils cannot even consider such 'life-plans' without encountering concrete examples to engage with and to react against, without being taught principles which are embodied in practices, without being confronted with signs of their potential scope and their effect on decisions, a sense of their potential sources and grounding, their demands and their

promises, their range of constituent elements and some integrating vision.[77] Constitutive communities, conveying through their teaching and ethos a 'thick' view of the good, might be described as necessary conditions for sustaining the possibility of truly autonomous lives.[78] At the same time, it is believed, they contribute to the building of society by providing first-hand experience of and comprehensive training in community life.[79]

7.5 Conclusion

My comments on Catholic schools as constitutive communities have culminated in a very strong claim, one which there is no room either to develop or to substantiate here: Catholic schools, insofar as they *are* constitutive communities, provide necessary conditions for the development and exercise of autonomy. Stated thus, this claim presents a major challenge to the common school ideal, integral to which is a concern for the promotion of autonomy. It is, however, not part of my purpose to argue that *only* Catholic schools can be constitutive communities; many other forms of schooling, those which are faith-based and indeed some kinds of common schools, given certain conditions, can also function as constitutive communities. Furthermore, it has not been suggested that constitutive communities, simply on the basis of their being constitutive, provide *sufficient* conditions for the development of autonomy. One would have add many of the features of inclusive pedagogy outlined in chapter five, augmented by considerations of how to foster critical thinking.

Rather, I have tried to show that Catholic schools, when they are true to the logic of their own philosophy and mission, far from being sectarian or parochial, have a concern for the common good as a high priority in their aims.80 It has also been

suggested here that evidence of the importance of the common good in Catholic schools might be considered in the light of their academic and social outcomes, the safeguarding role they play in counteracting prevailing imbalances or omissions in current educational assumptions and practices, and their positive, community-building role. According to the norms of the Catholic philosophy of education which have been articulated in this thesis, an inward-looking and isolationist form of schooling would represent a serious distortion, rather than an adequate reflection, of the universal and inclusive imperative within Catholicism.

Notes and references for chapter seven

[1]Individuals and communities outside the church will also, of course, contribute in significant ways to the critique of social policies, thus upholding the common good; their challenges will sometimes be allied to those of the churches against secular (or other religious) decisions and sometimes they will be directed against the churches where these are perceived to lose sight of the common good, perhaps in seeking to protect their own interests at its expense.

[2]See Pope John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1995, on the general principle of the central importance of ecumenism to Catholicism, and Priscilla Chadwick, *School of Reconciliation*, London, Cassell, 1994, for an analysis of progress and prospects for an ecumenical approach to Christian education. On the controversy among English Catholics regarding the appropriateness of maintaining Catholic schools as a major pastoral strategy for the faith community, see correspondence on this topic published in *The Tablet* during May and June 1997, especially pp.707, 737, 771-2. While there is little dispute about the claim that high standards of education are provided by many Catholic schools, there remains considerable uncertainty as to their effectiveness in promoting a commitment to Catholicism.

[3]The church community has to provide 15% of building costs for its voluntary aided schools. In the case of Grant Maintained Schools, still a minority of Catholic schools, the state pays full costs. Free transport to the nearest voluntary aided school, if it is further than three miles away, has been another cause of contention between the state and the Catholic church in recent years.

[4]James Arthur, in *The Ebbing Tide*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1995, pp.105, 113, 119 indicates some of the criticisms which have been levelled against Catholic schools : owing to their tight control over admissions they are able to avoid taking their fair share of really difficult pupils; because of the rigidity of the set of values they espouse they do not prepare their pupils for the real world; they do not adequately meet the needs of the increasing number of non-Catholic pupils who attend Catholic schools; they damage the interests of education in some localities.

[5]Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *A Struggle for Excellence*, London, 1997.

[6]For a range of arguments *pro* and *contra* the extension of voluntary status for minority faith schools, see Commission for Racial Equality, *Schools of Faith*, 1990, pp.8-19. cf Ger Snik and Johan de Jong, 'Liberalism and Denominational Schools', *The Journal of Moral Education*, vol. 24, No. 4, 1995, pp.395-407, especially p.402. : "liberals fear that group rights signify the first step towards segregation, 'apartheid', or 'balkanization'."..[They also] "shudder at the thought that the practice of group rights may result in the violation of individual rights."

[7]For consideration of objections to separate schools on educational grounds, see T.H. McLaughlin, 'The Ethics of Separate Schools', in *Ethics, Ethnicity and Education*, edited by Mal Leicester and Monica Taylor, London, Kogan Page, 1992, p.117., where four possible dangers are identified: threats to autonomy, inadequate breadth of curriculum, using education to serve a group's interests and failing to develop appropriate reasoning capacity; and also the same author's '"Education for All" and Religious Schools', in *Education for a Pluralist Society: Philosophical Perspectives on the Swann Report*, Bedford Way paper no. 30, University of London Institute of Education, 1987, where opposition to religious schools is considered under slightly different headings. These include the first two, relating to autonomy and breadth of curriculum, but instead of the concern about the instrumental use of education and the failure to promote critical rationality, this chapter focuses on concerns about differentiation of responsibilities and opposition to separate provision.

[8]As put by the Catholic theologian David Schindler, "Christians must embrace the world, but without becoming identified with it; and Christians must die to the world, but without removing themselves from it." Schindler, *Heart of the World, Center of the Church*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1996, p.1.

[9]Such premature identification is, according to Schindler, a defect of both integralist and liberation treatments of the church. "Thus an 'integralist' church seeks a relationship with the world, but does so through coercive means. A 'liberationist' church seeks a relationship with the world, but does so reductively, on the world's terms. ...If the risk of a 'progressive' liberation theology is a socialism which substitutes for the Gospel, the risk of a neoconservative theology . . . is a capitalism which puts the Gospel (the order of grace) off until the End Time. ...[The] intrinsic subordination of the world to the finality given in grace must always be maintained simultaneous with the juridical distinctness of state and Church. The former subordination without the latter distinctness entails 'integralism'; the latter distinctness without the former subordination entails secularism." Schindler, *op.cit.*, pp.24, 110, 85.

[10]For an interesting set of questions about the notion of the church as 'conscience of society', see Patrick Hannon: *Church, State, Morality and Law*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1992, p.11.

[11]Thus, in a sense, both church and state need each other for their mutual completion. This is a view put forward by the English Catholic historian Christopher Dawson in a series of lectures given in the USA: "The Church is socially incomplete unless there is a Christian society as well as an ecclesiastical congregation, and the State is morally incomplete without some spiritual bond other than the law and the power of the sword." Dawson, *The Crisis of Western Education*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1961, pp.107-8.

[12]For a concise treatment of three 'moments' in the relations between Catholicism and liberalism, (rejection, acceptance and criticism) see John Langan's chapter, 'Catholicism and Liberalism - 200 Years of Contest and Consensus', in *Liberalism and the Good*, edited by Bruce Douglass, Gerald Mara and Henry Richardson, New York, Routledge, 1990.

[13]Peter Steinfels, in *Catholicism and Liberalism*, edited by Bruce Douglass and David Hollenbach, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp.23-4.

[14]*Ibid.*, p.23.

[15]*Ibid.*, p.118. in Bruce Douglass' chapter 'Liberalism after the good times'. Further sources for and examples of similar analyses of weaknesses in liberal society can be found in Michael Sandel, *Democracy's Discontent*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1996; Amitai Etzioni, *The Spirit of Community*, London, Fontana, 1995; David Marquand and Anthony Seldon (eds), *Ideas That Shaped Post-War Britain*, London, Fontana, 1996; David Selbourne, *The Principle of Duty*, London, Sinclair Stevenson, 1994; Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, London, Duckworth, 1981.

[16]See sections 40-45 of *Gaudium et Spes.*

[17]Cf Joseph Komonchak (1994) in *Catholicism and Liberalism*, p.98.

[18]Owen Chadwick, *The Secularisation of the European Mind*, Cambridge University Press, 1978; Derek Holmes & Bernard Bickers, *A Short History of the Catholic Church*, Tunbridge Wells, Burns & Oates, 1983; K.O. von Aretin, *The Papacy in the Modern World*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970; Jean Comby with Diarmuid MacCulloch, *How to Read Church History*, vol. 2, London, SCM Press, 1989.

[19]Desmond Ryan, *The Catholic Parish : Institutional Discipline, Tribal Identity and Religious Development in the English Church*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1996, p.19.

[20]"The joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the men [*sic*] of our time, especially of those who are poor or afflicted in any way, are the joy and hope, the grief and anguish of the followers of Christ as well. Nothing that is genuinely human fails to find an echo in their hearts. ...Whatever truth, goodness, and justice is to be found in past or present human institutions is held in high esteem by the Council. In addition, the Council declares that the church is anxious to help and foster these institutions in so far as ... is compatible with its mission...The Council exhorts Christians, as citizens of two cities, to strive to discharge their earthly duties conscientiously...They are mistaken who, knowing that we have here no abiding city but seek one which is to come, think that they may therefore shirk their earthly responsibilities. One of the gravest errors of our times is the dichotomy between the faith which many profess and the practice of their daily lives...Let there be no false opposition between professional and social activities on the one part, and religious life on the other. The Christian who neglects his temporal duties neglects his duties toward his neighbour and even God, and jeopardizes his eternal salvation." *Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World), paragraphs 1, 42,43. from Walter Abbott (ed), *The Documents of Vatican II*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1967.

[21]*Lumen Gentium*, paragraphs 9 and 48; see also *Gaudium et Spes*, paragraph 42. Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1974, pp.58-70 provides a detailed analysis of what is meant by the church as sacrament.

[22]Leonardo Boff, *Church, Charism & Power*, London, SCM Press, 1985, p.2.

[23]*Gaudium et Spes*, loc.cit, paragraph 75.

[24]Kenneth Grasso, Gerard Bradley and Robert Hunt (eds), *Catholicism, Liberalism & Communitarianism*, Lanham, Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1995, pp.31-2.

[25]I explored human personhood in some depth in chapter four. In 7.3 I examine further the notion of the common good which includes reference to both subsidiarity and solidarity.

[26]For this section I rely principally on the collection of selected writings of J.C. Murray, *Bridging the Sacred and the Secular*, edited by Leon Hooper, Washington, DC, Georgetown University Press, 1994. A critical commentary on the continuing relevance of Murray's work is provided by Thomas Hughson: *The Believer As Citizen*, New Jersey, Paulist Press, 1993.

[27]Hughson (*op.cit.*, pp.37, 117) picks out four key principles from Murray's work: a) an irreducible difference between Church and state; b) an effective primacy in dignity of the spiritual; c) the independence of the political; d) the finality of church-state relations toward a practical cooperation for the good of the believer-citizen."

[28]*Bridging the Sacred and the Secular*, p.216.

[29]*Ibid.*, p.218.

[30]*Ibid.*, p.216.

[31]J.C. Murray, *The Problem of Religious Freedom*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1965, pp.44-5.

[32]Apart from the fact that we do not know how Murray would have responded to social, political and ecclesiastical developments in the thirty years since his death, he was vulnerable to some criticisms in the face of some of the issues of his own time. Accusations levelled against him suggest that he was "silent on racial questions, inadequately treated economic issues, misunderstood communism, and failed to appreciate the new "human reality" brought about by the development of nuclear weapons." Brian Benestad, 'Catholicism & American Public Philosophy', *Review of Politics*, vol. 53, 1991, pp. 691-711, at p.703. Schindler criticises Murray for displaying a nature-grace dualism which colludes with liberal autonomy and the privatization of religion, and hence to secularism. Schindler, *op.cit.*, pp.37, 65.

[33]In sacred scripture there is a developing theology of creation, of history, of stewardship and of covenant, all of which have a bearing on the common good, the sense of a communal relationship with God, and, through God, with each other. The legal and liturgical elements in scripture also reinforce the strong emphasis on community and the common good.

[34]Pope John XXIII, quoted by Canavan (1995), in *Catholicism, Liberalism & Communitarianism*, p.25. Cf *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994, pp.418-421., where three essential elements of the common good are identified as :1) "respect for the person" [so that he has room to exercise natural freedoms such as :]... "conscience, privacy, and religious freedom"; 2) "social well being and development of the group" [which includes a mixture of all

that is needed for a human life, such as:] "food, clothing, health, work, education and culture, information" [etc]; 3) "peace and security." [Although] "the human good is always oriented towards the progress of the person" [there is an]... "obligation on all to participate in promoting the good"; ... "both personal responsibility and public life" [are essential]..."Everyone should be concerned to create and support institutions that improve the conditions of life."

[35]Jacques Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good*, London, Geoffrey Bles, 1948, pp.43, 53.

[36]*Ibid.*, p.46.

[37]*Ibid.*, p.51.

[38]*Ibid.*, p.52. He went on: "and he is constituted a part of the family society before he is constituted a part of the political society".

[39]For an extremely brief attempt to articulate a minimal foundation of common values for schools and society, see School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (London, 1996), *Consultation on values in education and the community.* This focuses on the values and principles for action relating to society, relationships, the self and the environment. With regard to society there is clearly an aspiration to promote 'collective endeavour for the common good'. p.2. Cf. Bruce Douglass, 'Public Philosophy & Contemporary Pluralism', *Thought*, 64 (December 1989), pp.344-361. Douglass discusses the inadequacy of the liberal individualist focus in contemporary society on "self-realisation" and the need to adapt the pursuit of freedom to a respect for virtue. "What is needed is a way of thinking which combines a fuller, more determinate conception of the human good with a more realistic appreciation of the social character of our existence." (Douglass, pp.352, 358.) A more recent critique of the inadequacies of the 'procedural republic' and the need for a greater focus on the common good is given by Michael Sandel, *Democracy's Discontent*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Belknap for Harvard University Press, 1996. Sandel argues for more confidence in promoting throughout society "a sense of belonging, a concern for the whole, a moral bond with the community...the civic virtues...civic engagement...the obligations of solidarity....A procedural republic cannot contain the moral energies of a vital democratic life...and it fails to cultivate the qualities of character that equip citizens to share in self-rule." (Sandel, pp.5, 6, 13, 24.) Cf also Robert Bellah et al., *The Good Society*, New York, Vintage Books, Random House, 1992. For a very different attempt to establish common ground, this time within the Catholic Church, in order to overcome polarisation and to promote unity, see Joseph Bernadin, 'The Common Ground Project - Called to be Catholic', *Doctrine & Life*, Vol. 46, 1996, pp. 490-496 (first published in *Origins*, Vol. 29, No. 11, 29/8/96). See also David Hollenbach, 'The Common Good, Pluralism and Catholic Education', in *The Contemporary Catholic School*, edited by McLaughlin et al, 1996, pp.89-103.

[40]Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, London, 1996, *The Common Good and the Catholic Church's Social Teaching.*

[41]In May 1997, immediately after the General Election, the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales issued a follow-up document, *The Common Good In Education.*

[42]*The Common Good and the Catholic Church's Social Teaching*, p.12. The common good is to be seen as "a guarantor of individual rights, and as the necessary public context in which conflicts of individual rights and interests can be adjudicated or reconciled."

[43]*Ibid.*, p.8.

[44]*Ibid.*, p.13. Local institutions are to be defended against central ones. Authority should be "as close to the grass roots as good government allows." In the light of my earlier summary of his contribution to the development of Catholic thought about society and politics, it should be noted that J.C. Murray relied on the mediating structures of family, church and school to further moral standards.

[45]Bishops' Conference, *The Common Good and the Catholic Church's Social Teaching*, p.13, quoting Pius XI, (1931), *Quadragesimo Anno.* A more developed analysis of subsidiarity is provided by Jean Bethke Elshtain, who summarises an article on this topic by Joseph Komonchak by listing nine basic elements: (1) the priority of the person as origin and purpose of society; (2) the essential sociality of the human person, whose self-realization is through social relations - the principle of solidarity; (3) social relationships and communities exist to provide help to individuals and this "subsidiary" function of society does not supplant self-responsibility, but augments it; (4) "higher" communities exist to perform the same subsidiary roles toward "lower" communities; (5) communities must enable and encourage individuals to exercise their self-responsibility and larger communities do the same for smaller ones; (6) communities are not to deprive individuals and smaller communities of their rights to exercise self-responsibility; (7) subsidiarity serves as a principle to regulate interrelations between individuals and communities, and between smaller and larger communities; (8) subsidiarity is a formal principle that can be embodied only in particular communities and circumstances; (9) subsidiarity is a universal principle, grounded in a particular ontology of the person. Elshtain, in *Catholicism and Liberalism*, p.161. (The Komonchak article summarised by Elshtain is his 'Subsidiarity in the Church: The State of the Question', *The Jurist*, Vol. 48, 1988.)

[46]Bishops' Conference, *The Common Good and the Catholic Church's Social Teaching*, p.14. "This then is not a feeling of vague compassion or shallow distress at the misfortunes of so many people, both near and far. On the contrary it is a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good." *ibid.* (quoting Pope John Paul II, 1992, *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*). Solidarity is closely related to Aristotle's description (in his *Ethics*) of civic friendship. It also echoes Aquinas's treatment of justice as the establishing of a right order in society, one which orients all the virtues. (*Summa Theologicae*, q. 58, art. 6.)

[47]Cf the comment by Aidan Nichols, quoted by James Arthur (1995), *op. cit.*, p. 165. : "Principles of subsidiarity and local initiative, unless cross-grained by principles of solidarity and union, serve as centrifugal forces allowing the denigration of the

Church into a congeries of congregational bodies whose experiences of faith are no more than analogues one for another."

[48]For an analysis of the relationship between solidarity, interdependency, mutuality of interest, collective conscience and loyalty, see Larry May, *The Socially Responsive Self*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1996, pp.31-2, 39, 43-45.

[49]Bishops' Conference, *The Common Good and the Catholic Church's Social Teaching*, p.3.

[50]*Ibid.*, p.7. Cf. p.17. "'Common' implies 'all-inclusive': the common good cannot exclude or exempt any section of the population." All should therefore both contribute to and benefit from the common good.

[51]*Ibid.*, p.10. From the right to life flows the right "to those conditions which make life more truly human: religious liberty, decent work, housing, health care, freedom of speech, education, and the right to raise and provide for a family."

[52]*Ibid.*, pp.17-27.

[53]See Paddy Walsh, 'Jesuit Schools: a case study', paper given at International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996; Joseph O'Keefe and Regina Haney (eds), *Conversations in Excellence*, Boston and New York, Boston College/National Catholic Educational Association, 1998; Thomas Oldenski, *Liberation Theology and Critical Pedagogy in Today's Catholic Schools*, New York, Garland Publishing, 1997; *Foundations*, compiled by Carl Meirose, SJ, for the Jesuit Secondary Education Association, Washington, DC, 1994; Peter Hastings, 'Openness and Intellectual Challenge in Catholic Schools', in *The Contemporary Catholic School*, (CCS) pp.272-283; the whole of Part Three of CCS, pp.175-253 focuses on aspects of social justice in Catholic schools. *The Common Good in Education*, a commentary on the implications of the (Catholic) Church's social teaching for the work of Catholic schools and colleges, was published by the Catholic Education Service in May 1997. One of the five major themes of this document is the option for the poor. [Rather strangely, this section is given the title 'option against the poor', despite the clear emphasis on promoting their interests.] The poor are taken (p.11) to include "the disruptive, the withdrawn, the unattractive, those who find it difficult to make friends [and] those who struggle to keep up with the majority." The other themes treated in this document are the dignity of the human person and the social dimension of faith; subsidiarity and solidarity; morality in the market place; and the world of work. On the centrality of concern for social justice within a Catholic approach to education, see Thomas Groome, *Educating For Life*, Allen, Texas, Thomas More Press, 1998, chapter 8.

[54]A high level of solidarity between and among Catholic schools has not always been as evident as might be expected, given the prominence of this in recent treatments of Catholic social and educational principles.

[55]Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1977, art. 12, emphasises the role of the Catholic school in equipping pupils "to make their own positive contribution, in a spirit of cooperation, to the building up of the secular society". For evidence of constant reference by the

Catholic Bishops of England and Wales to concern for the common good in educational matters in recent years, see *Partners in Mission*, Catholic Education Service, 1997, pp. 67, 70, 124, 127, 129.

[56]See The Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1988, art. 45, p. 22. "A Christian education must promote respect for the State and its representatives, the observance of just laws, and a search for the common good. Therefore, traditional civic values such as freedom, justice, the nobility of work and the need to pursue social progress are all included among the school goals....Catholic schools help to form good citizens." Fayette Ververke, 'The Ambiguity of Catholic Educational Separatism', *Religious Education*,vol. 80, no. 1, p.79. quotes John Lapp, (1923) on religion (in the American context of nation-building) as "the animating motive of true citizenship...The Catholic school teaches justice, charity, fair play and obedience to proper authority. If these virtues are correlated with the civic life of the community, a powerful force for civic righteousness will be developed." See John Coleman in *Education for Citizenship*, edited by Mary Boys, New York, The Pilgrim Press, 1989, p.35. "What citizenship adds to discipleship [is] : a wider solidarity, a humbler service, a new reality test for responsibility; what discipleship adds to citizenship [is] : [the ideas of] utopia, counterculture and vocation." Coleman comments further on: "the duties of citizenship protect the church from a narrow parochial introspection". *Ibid.*, p.59. cf also the summary of Coleman's views on this topic in Mary Boys, *Educating in Faith: Maps and Visions*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1989, pp.179-180. : "Citizenship widens the scope of one's love of neighbour,...offers the opportunity for ... sharing in the day-to-day *ascesis* of giving form to vision ...and demands the church becomes knowledgeable about the resolution of conflict, about economics, about food and transportation systems, and other issues so vital in the global village."

[57]OFSTED reports are available to the general public. I do not claim to have made a thorough study of the comparative achievements of Catholic and other schools, but my consultancy work in Catholic and other schools across the south of England (which often requires careful reading of both their secular and religious inspection reports) and the discussions I have had with OFSTED, LEA, diocesan and Catholic Education Service inspectors and officers does indicate that, on academic grounds, Catholic schools frequently do better than might be expected from their pupil intake. This picture seems to be replicated right across the country and is a factor influencing the popularity of church schools among parents, including many who are not from the Catholic community. See the two Catholic Education Service reports on *Quality in Catholic Schools*, London, 1995, 1997; Andrew Morris's five articles, (i) 'The Academic performance of Catholic schools', *School Organisation*, Vol. 14, 1994, pp.81-89, (ii) 'The Catholic School Ethos : its effect on post-16 student academic achievement', *Educational Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1995, pp.67-83, (iii) 'Same Mission, Same Methods, Same Results?', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, December 1997, pp.378-391, (iv) 'So Far, So Good: levels of academic achievement in Catholic Schools', *Educational Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1998, (v) 'Catholic and other secondary schools: an analysis of OFSTED inspection reports', *Educational*

Research; Vol. 40, No. 2, 1998; Anthony Bryk (et al), *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, Harvard University Press, 1993; Marcellin Flynn, *The Culture of Catholic Schools*, Homebush, (Australia), St Pauls, 1993.

[58]Mark Holmes (in 'The Place of Religion in Public Education, *Interchange*, vol. 24, No. 3, 1993, p.215) cites evidence from Canada that those raised within a strong, religious family are better citizens than those raised without. A positive relationship is identified between regularity of church attendance and positive social characteristics. Such evidence does not necessarily transfer automatically to the UK, but it does cohere with separate findings both here (for example by Leslie Francis: see 'Morals and religion' by David Hay, *The Tablet*, 3/2/96, p.132) and in the USA (for example, by Andrew Greeley: *Catholic High Schools and Minority Students*, New Brunswick, N.J, Transaction Press, 1982 and Bryk's work already cited in chapter one, above).

[59]On the duty of *all* people to protect and to advance the cause of the common good, see Marsden, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1997, p.46. On the need to promote among *pupils* qualities conducive to the common good, see *The Common Good In Education*, p.7. For an interesting study, in the context of Jewish education, of the effects of religious schooling on *teachers*, see M. Warnet and J. Klein, 'The Levels of Religious Schooling and Practices of Teachers and their Perception of School Leadership', *British Journal of Religious Education*, vol. 19, No. 3, Summer 1997, especially pp.159, 161.

[60]Although Bryk, 1993, provides evidence from the USA for the stronger claim, I have already indicated, in chapter one, above, that the significant differences between Catholic schools in the USA and the UK should prevent us from assuming that what can be claimed of Catholic schools in one context necessarily applies elsewhere.

[61]See Declaration on Christian Education, issued in 1965 and published in *The Documents of Vatican II*, edited by Walter Abbott, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1967, arts. 3 & 6, pp.641, 644.)

[62]See Mark Halstead, 'Voluntary Apartheid? Problems of Schooling for Religious and Other Minorities in Democratic Societies', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 29, No. 2, 1995, pp.257-272. [Religious minorities] "would find it difficult to accept an education in which for 95% of the time their children were subject to a 'neutral' or secular curriculum while 5% was devoted to their own cultural or religious beliefs and practices. The 95% would be perceived as potentially undermining the faith." *(ibid.*, p.264.)

[63]See Desmond Ryan (1996), *op.cit.* Figures provided by the *Catholic Directory 1997* indicate a significant drop in Mass-attendance. This is usually accompanied by an even larger drop in participation in the other sacraments. Information given to me by the Director of the Catholic Education Service in 1996 showed an increase both in the proportion of baptised Catholic children attending church schools and in the proportion of pupils who are not Catholic who attend these schools.

[64]With reduced pupil rolls in inner city areas, some Catholic schools are actually struggling to attract sufficient numbers of pupils, both of Catholic pupils in particular

and of pupils in general. Evidence of this situation is provided in *The Struggle for Excellence*, 1997.

[65]For a different and more detailed analysis, see T.H. McLaughlin, 'The Scope of Parents' Rights', in *Parental Choice in Education*, edited by Mark Halstead, London, Kogan Page, 1994.

[66]Other faith communities too might wish to rely on the principle of subsidiarity, which has a wide application. See Stephen Macedo, 'Multiculturalism for the Religious Right?', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 29, No. 2, 1995, pp.223-238. Macedo points out that religious communities, as intermediate associations, "often challenge the materialism, hedonism and this-worldliness which is so dominant in our time...[and they] furnish alternative sources of meaning which keep alive the intellectual arguments by which truth is supposedly approached in a liberal polity....Accommodating religious practice is especially important now lest the ever-encroaching tentacles of state control choke off the space which autonomous communities require." (*Ibid.*, pp.229-230.)

[67]Subsidiarity is now an accepted doctrine underlying political, economic and social development within the European Union.

[68]Langan points out that "the area where the church will exhibit the most resistance to liberal ideas and practices is in its own internal life." See John Langan, *loc.cit.*, p.121.

[69]See Christopher Dawson's comment in *The Crisis of Western Education*: "For modern society, like all societies, needs some higher spiritual principle of co-ordination to overcome the conflicts between power and morality, between reason and appetite, between technology and humanity and between self-interest and the common good." (p.159.)

[70]See Ger Snik & Johan de Jong, 'Liberalism and Denominational Schools', *The Journal of Moral Education*, Vol. 24, No. 4, 1995, pp.395-407.. These writers indicate the important role played by communities in the development of personal identity and they refer to Kymlica's view that cultural membership is not in contrast with individual freedom, but rather a precondition of it. (W. Kymlica, *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989, p.206.) *Cf.* Mike Golby, 'Communitarianism and Education', Papers of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference at Oxford, (March 1996), p.152. Golby contrasts 'constitutive' communities with "those we enter into for temporary, prudential, recreational or other reasons and whose loss would not afflict our sense of who we are".

[71]For an essay which presses the case for a metaphysical foundation and narrative for education, see Neil Postman, *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School*, New York, Fodor Press, 1996. Postman has argued that there needs to be "a transcendent narrative, one that constructs ideals, prescribes rules of conduct, provides a source of authority and gives a sense of continuity and purpose." *The Guardian*, 21st December, 1996.

[72]See James Fowler, 'Character, Conscience and the Education of the Public', especially pp. 236-240, in *The Challenge of Pluralism*, edited by F. Clark Power and

Daniel Lapsley, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1992. On the close connection between group affiliations and the development of a sense of morality, see Larry May, *op.cit.*, pp.3-4, 13, 27. Mouw and Griffioen (*Pluralisms & Horizons*, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Eerdmans, 1993, pp.81, 82, 115, 116) bring out clearly the role of traditions, communal memories and mediating structures (such as families, churches, synagogues, ethnic alliances and a variety of community and service organizations) in providing indispensable resources for the creation of a healthy society and for development of a "buffer zone that can help us to avoid the false choice between individualism and statism in political life." Note also their comment (p.164) that "if the work of the state reinforces and builds upon that which has already occurred in the less public associational contexts, then the state must respect and protect those more intimate spheres as having their own integrity within the civilizing scheme of things."

[73]*Cf* Stanley Hauerwas, *In Good Company : The Church as Polis*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1995, p.9. "Those who have gone before ...made and continue to make our faithful living possible through that skill called memory. Such a memory is not 'in the head', but rather in the material habits that make us what we are."

[74]*Cf* Amy Gutman (in her introduction, as editor, to *Multiculturalism*, by Charles Taylor, Princeton University Press, 1994, p.7.) "The unique, self-creating, and creative conception of human beings is not to be confused with a picture of 'atomistic' individuals creating their identities *de novo* and pursuing their ends independently of each other. Part of the uniqueness of individuals results from the ways in which they integrate, reflect upon, and modify their own cultural heritage and that of other people with whom they come into contact. Human identity is created, as Taylor puts it, *dialogically*, in response to our relations, including our actual dialogues." Alasdair MacIntyre provides a highly positive and optimistic view of sub-communities within the wider *polis* in *After Virtue*, London, Duckworth, 1981. Eamonn Callan suggests that the developmental antecedents of mature liberal virtues might possibly be better served in separate schools. He is critical of Rawls for neglecting "the ways in which individuals achieve an initial understanding of their good in a specific cultural setting, where the good is conceived according to a received moral vocabulary that fixes the normative content of roles and the social practices they sustain." Callan, *Creating Citizens*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997, p.181.

[75]*Cf.* William Galston, 'Civic Education in the Liberal State', in *Liberalism and the Moral Life*, edited by Nancy Rosenblum, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1989, p.101. "The greatest threat to children in modern liberal societies is not that they will believe in something too deeply, but that they will believe in nothing very deeply at all." See also Shabbir Akhtar, 'Muslims and their schools', *The Tablet*, 14 February 1998, p.208. : "It can be argued that if communities are given the space to assert their own uniqueness, they are better equipped to fit in to a plural culture. A child with a secure sense of identity can have a better chance of making sense of the different voices within such a culture." My argument that Catholic schools are constitutive communities, if it has any cogency, applies to other faith-based forms of education such as Islamic schools.

[76]There is a close connection between this aspect of my argument and the points raised earlier on subsidiarity.

[77]Marsden, *op.cit.*, p.101, speaks of the need for a strong institutional base if Christian scholarship is to flourish.

[78]My argument here is similar in some respects to that of T.H. McLaughlin, although it is not exactly parallel. See 'Parental Rights in Religious Upbringing and RE Within a Liberal Perspective', PhD thesis, University of London Institute of Education, 1990. My argument does reflect his comment that "*one* way in which autonomy might be developed is *from the basis of* a form of schooling *within* a determinate religious tradition of belief, value and practice...a basis from which pupils might be launched on their own search for autonomous agency." (*ibid.*, p.199.) *Cf.* Deborah Fitzmaurice, in *Liberalism, Multiculturalism and Toleration*, edited by John Horton, London, Macmillan, 1993, p.68. "To be autonomous is not to be free-floating, but to be always engaged or potentially engaged in a kind of dialectic between reflectiveness and embeddedness. The inculcation of settled standards in early life is as much a prerequisite for this as the nurture of the critical faculties." See Patrick Riordan, (*A Politics of the Common Good*, Dublin, Institute of Public Administration, 1996, pp. 120, 125, 135, 150) on the role of institutions in sustaining the conditions which promote autonomy and how protecting the role of such institutions is an element in the common good. *Cf.* Nicholas Lash, *The Beginning and the End of 'Religion'*, London, SCM Press, 1996, p. 21. "The modern dissociation of memory from argument, of narrative from reason, made us forget how deeply all understanding and imagination is shaped by memory, coloured by circumstance, constituted by tradition". Lash describes the religious traditions as "*schools*" (the emphasis is his) "whose pedagogy has the twofold purpose...of weaning us from our idolatry and purifying our desire." (*ibid.*) For them to carry out this task they must each provide "the kind of *culture* which can embody, sustain and communicate the tale" that conveys their particular worldview. (*ibid.*, p.235) The salvific knowledge which they aim to transmit is inseparable from the path of discipleship as laid down, interpreted and illustrated by the tradition. As Lash says, "where the knowledge of God is concerned, it is discipleship which furnishes the necessary context of experience', and key words employed by the tradition, such as 'faith', 'hope' and 'love' do not refer to "individual, private, psychic states or attitudes" but to "shared and public patterns of conviction and behaviour." (*ibid.*, p.155.) For a warning that cultures must not be allowed to become hermetically sealed off and for a demonstration of the tension between the demands of democracy and those of cultural preservation, see Basil Singh, 'Shared Values, Particular Values, and Education for a Multicultural Society', in *Educational Review*, Vol. 47, No. 1, 1995, pp.11-24. For an alternative argument, that initiation and liberation are not incompatible in the context of Christian education, see Elmer Thiessen, *Teaching for Commitment*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1993, chapters 8 and 9. Kevin Williams, 'State Support for Church Schools: Is it Justifiable?', in *Studies in Education*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1995, pp.37-47 and J.M. Halstead, *The Case for Muslim Voluntary-Aided Schools*, Cambridge, The Islamic

Academy, 1986 offer alternative justifications, parallel to my own, for faith-based education in the context of a pluralist society.

[79]*The Catholic School*, art. 13, p.9.

[80]Groome (*op.cit.*, p.42) offers a definition of sectarianism as "a bigoted and intolerant exaltation of one's own group that absolutizes the true and good in its members, encouraging prejudice against anyone who has alternative identity." Parochialism, likewise, he says (*ibid.*, p.44), reflects "a narrow-minded, self-sufficient, and insular mentality that closes up within itself, is intolerant to or oblivious of other perspectives, and is conceited about its own."

CHAPTER EIGHT

Conclusion

As part of the church's mission to spread the gospel, Catholic schools need to make their 'story' attractive, credible, even compelling.[1] If they do not preserve their distinctive identity, there will be no special reason for their separate existence.[2] A community which lacks a strong sense of self-awareness, of shared values and of common goals will not have the resources or the motivation with which to be inclusive. But if it seeks too energetically to be distinctive, it can slip into appearing exclusive, either in membership or in tone, thus preventing many pupils from 'receiving' the gospel.[3] This thesis has grappled with key aspects of the problematical relationship between distinctiveness, inclusiveness and exclusiveness in the philosophy of Catholic education.

In this final chapter, first I summarise what has been attempted and the main findings of the thesis, acknowledging some aspects of the problem which received less prominence than they deserved. Second, key stages in the argument are shown to be closely-inter-related. Third, there is an indication of some of the further work required in Catholic schools if the 'story' of Catholic education told here is to bear fruit in practice and so render my argument credible. Fourth, possible directions for building on the thesis are suggested. Finally, I anticipate, in hope, a change of emphasis within the wider debate about the nature of Catholicism, a modification which might take at least some of its bearings from the limited treatment here of the dialectic between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic schools.

8.1 Main findings

Theological and educational literature are often studied quite separately and without reference to one another. Here they have been brought together in a dialogue, showing the bearing of theological thinking on educational philosophy and both the constraints on and opportunities for the outworking of theology in relation to educational practice and contexts. The thesis provides an extended commentary on the principles enunciated in the key Roman documents on Catholic education which were analysed in chapter three. It relates these to the particular context of Catholic schools in England and Wales, exposes an ambivalence in the documents and in the purposes of Catholic schools and suggests a way for Catholic schools to avoid the ambivalence and to be both distinctive and inclusive. This analysis could serve a mediating function between the global expression of key Catholic principles for education and their local application.[4] It could also provide a resource for teachers who work in Catholic schools (or those who intend to do so), to assist them in engaging with the rationale of these schools.

The degree to which this relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness is problematical has been insufficiently acknowledged in past studies of Catholic education. Yet, central to the future of educational policy for Catholic schools will be a satisfactory resolution of this relationship, even if such a resolution has to be revised in each generation. The thesis shows that, if Catholic schools are to be true to their foundational principles, they must be both distinctive and inclusive. Distinctiveness and inclusiveness are correlative terms: one implies the other; they are integrally related. While these terms represent essential (and compatible) polarities within a Catholic philosophy of education, there are certain limits on the degree of inclusiveness possible.

There are proper constraints, too, on the expression of distinctiveness, although they have been given less prominence here. These constraints arise partly from the compulsory nature of school, which, especially for older pupils, reduces the scope for worship and service, neither of which can be imposed without undermining their integrity. Although both are possible in the school context, for their fullest expression they require other contexts, for example, the family, the community and the church. Another constraint arises from the fact that Catholic schools receive public support, in return for which they must attend to legitimate non-religious educational purposes, priorities and standards, as part of the common good.[5] To the extent that these aims are pursued there may be less scope for the fullest expression of the distinctive Catholic worldview in Catholic schools. However, I have shown that the concern to promote the common good, far from being a mere concession to political realities, is an integral feature of Catholic education.

In the process of examining the coherence of the claims of Catholic education to be both distinctive and inclusive, major features of a Catholic philosophy and theology of education have been clarified and re-presented. In particular, the notion of 'living tradition' has been retrieved and its potential for showing how Catholic education can be both distinctive and inclusive has been demonstrated. Key insights from the writings of Blondel have been appropriated and applied to this task. Again, central themes from the Catholic church's recent official philosophy of education, the integral development of the human person, the autonomy of the disciplines and the synthesis between faith, culture and life, have been illustrated by reference to the work of another neglected thinker, Friedrich von Hügel. His work shows how these three themes can co-exist creatively and it offers a fertile source for understanding how the institutional, intellectual and spiritual dimensions of Catholicism mutually reinforce

and correct each other. If Catholic schools are to be both distinctive and inclusive, they will need to do justice to all three of these dimensions and in the attempt to do so they could find inspiration and guidance from von Hügel.

8.2 Unity and interconnectedness of the thesis

The first four chapters were intended, in turn, (1) to identify and provide a focus for the problem in educational theory to be examined, (2) to set this in the particular context of Catholic schools in late twentieth century England and Wales, (3) to analyse the main features of Catholic educational principles and (4) to outline the underlying worldview which 'colours' or shapes these principles.

In chapter one it was suggested that the polarity distinctive/inclusive, although historically deeply rooted within Catholicism, has been freshly highlighted and subjected to new pressures through recent educational developments in this country, such as the managerial imperative. In my review of contrasting studies of Catholic education, I argued that, despite their valuable insights, they failed to address the problematical nature of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness. After situating the argument in the particular social and political context of England and Wales, where a dual system of education exists, with responsibility shared, though unequally, by church and state, chapter two related educational changes to wider theological developments within the Catholic church. It was shown how educational and theological changes combined to require of Catholic educators both a reinterpretation of the *raison d'etre* of separate schooling and a fresh urgency in clarifying the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in such schools.

Taken together, chapters three and four seek to bring out the parameters of the claim that Catholic education is distinctive. With regard to Catholic educational principles, several features were shown jointly to constitute this distinctiveness: (a) the insistence on treating the secular and sacred in the curriculum as intimately and mutually implicated; (b) the creative tension to be maintained between the integral development of persons, the autonomy of the disciplines and the synthesis between faith, life and culture; (c) the centrality of Christ, both as teacher of salvific truth and as model for human development, leading to a view of education which forms, informs and transforms learners; and (d) the priority given to a particular interpretation of interconnectedness between all elements in education, (message, community, worship and service). Underpinning these features a distinctive worldview was identified, the 'economy' of which combined elements of an anthropology, a theology of creation, a Christology and an ecclesiology. In marking out some of the contours of this worldview I discussed the bearing on education of a Catholic understanding of conscience, conversion and character, of sin, salvation and the soul, of being made in God's image and of the implications of a personal vocation.

The interpenetration of intellectual, moral and religious dimensions and perspectives, as presented in these two chapters, cumulatively brought out some of the difficulties inherent in the distinctive pole of Catholic thought. To emphasize distinctiveness thus 'goes against the grain' of many taken-for-granted views, for example, those relating to human nature and development, morality, rationality and freedom. It represents a 'thick' view of the good which is contestable in the wider society. It seems to rely on the assumption that this view is fixed within and receives unanimous support from the Catholic community, whereas in practice it is open to further development, fresh interpretations and alternative accounts from within that faith community. It could be criticized for paying too little attention to the ecumenical imperative within Christianity

and for being insufficiently trusting of the influence of individual Christians formed by scripture and prayer. It gives priority to religious concerns to a degree that threatens to undermine secular considerations, and this despite Catholic teaching about nature and grace. It constitutes an interconnectedness which, while pointing towards separate schooling as a desirable educational environment, is also vulnerable to the criticism that it paves the way for an all-embracing ethos which some might experience as suffocating or totalitarian.

I have highlighted here, in a rather one-sided manner, the 'uncomfortable' aspects of the 'story' of distinctiveness in order to bring out the challenges it presents in the educational context. That this is an inadequate representation of the claim to distinctiveness has already been anticipated in my treatment of von Hügel, whose work I drew upon in order to demonstrate that, built into the key educational principles which are normative for Catholic schools and deeply integral to the worldview which underpins them, there is a capacity for, indeed, an imperative towards, inclusiveness. Chapters five, six and seven relate the claim to distinctiveness to the claim to inclusiveness, first (chapter five), by considering several dimensions of inclusiveness and exclusiveness *within* Catholic schools and teasing out how these cohere with the distinctiveness previously outlined, then, (chapter six), by developing the notion of 'living tradition' as a way of fruitfully combining distinctiveness with inclusiveness in such schools, and finally (chapter seven), by seeking to rebut the accusation of exclusiveness from the perspective of the common good.

In chapter five I showed that the Catholic claim to offer a distinctive approach to education was not only *compatible* with the notion of inclusiveness; I argued further that many of the characteristics of inclusiveness which I had identified were *intrinsic* to a Catholic philosophy of education. A creative tension, rather than an

incompatibility, was shown to exist between the two poles. Their reciprocal interrelationship is such that one is intimately implicated in the other, with both polarities simultaneously reinforcing and qualifying their correlates.

Like other close relationships, the connections between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education cannot be precisely predicted, definitely determined, comprehensively charted or finally fixed. Their 'cohabitation arrangements' are always subject to revision, modification and adjustment in the light of fresh understandings, new challenges, experiences of achievement, the availability of resources and the stresses arising from shortcomings (or excesses) on both sides. And just as no authority can legislate for relationships or prescribe in advance the way they must inevitably develop, - for this will depend upon the day-to-day interpretations and actions, the flexibility of the partners and their mutual sensitivity and responsiveness, - so too the ongoing (and constantly provisional) working out of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness within Catholic education will depend, in large part, on the day-to-day interactions and interpretations of teachers and pupils, rather than on edicts from the hierarchy of the church, or from any other source.

However, Catholic schools do not engage in the dialectic between distinctiveness and inclusiveness as if it has just arisen; they enter a debate which has a long history and they belong to a tradition from which it is wise to seek guidance. Thus (in chapter six) the notion of living tradition was examined for the light it cast on the task of addressing this dialectic. With the help of insights from Blondel I showed that a retrieval of this notion offers a way to combine fidelity to the past and openness to the present. It also assists in the process of avoiding the opposite dangers of ossification or assimilation. If living tradition is critically appreciated and creatively appropriated,

Catholic education can be distinctively holistic without undermining the autonomy of the disciplines or of pupils; it can also be inclusively open while neither abdicating its responsibility to proclaim truth nor compromising on essentials.

In chapter seven I reviewed a range of possible objections to the maintenance of separate Catholic schools. I then explored how developments in the Catholic understanding of the relationship between church and world provide a platform for a defence of the positive role which may be played by Catholic schools in society. After an exposition of a Catholic understanding of the common good I constructed a seven strand case to support the claim that Catholic schools contribute significantly to that good. A concern for the common good was shown to be an integral feature of a Catholic philosophy of education.

A creative tension, paralleling that between distinctiveness and inclusiveness, exists also between church and world and between the twin foundational principles which have received more prominence in Catholic social thought in recent years, solidarity and subsidiarity. In this context it may be argued that Catholic schools which reflect in practice their own distinctive educational philosophy will reflect this tension. On the one hand, they will offer a counter-cultural witness, one which fosters a critique of society and which prevents an over-identification with the world on the part of their pupils. On the other hand, they will avoid being elitist, divisive, isolationist or withdrawn from society and they will seek to promote among their pupils a strong sense of social responsibility, the understanding, capacity and commitment to build up the wider community and to strive, along with others, for the furtherance and flourishing of the common good. In supporting the maintenance of this creative tension, the use of Roman authority within the church is double edged: it can serve as a counterweight against tendencies to accommodate too readily to the various and

particular secular pressures faced by Catholics; it can also, when used in a heavy-handed way, increase the secularizing trends by adding to the fear and suspicion of ecclesially based forms of education and authoritarian defences of orthodoxy.[6]

The notion of 'constitutive' communities and the principles of solidarity and subsidiarity, taken together, provide essential guidance for Catholic schools on how living tradition is to be constructed, sustained, communicated and developed. As a constitutive community, a Catholic school aims to provide, in the context of a highly developed partnership between school, home and church, a coherent curriculum which is given unity and focus by the integrating perspective of Christian faith and a powerful example of the nature, scope and costs of commitment. Through engagement with a 'thick' view of the good, a coherent and comprehensive account of the world, and a living tradition, it is hoped that pupils would be given a firm foundation for developing a sense of identity and belonging as well the ability and willingness to reflect critically on this tradition and to reach out to and work with others outside it.

It follows from the arguments developed in this thesis that Catholic schools should aim to promote among their pupils both a critical solidarity with tradition and a critical openness to society. Appropriation of and solidarity with the tradition should necessarily lead to a determination to extend that initial solidarity much further and to contribute positively to the wider society as well as an awareness of its shortcomings and dangers. Openness to others will entail an embracing of the many dimensions of inclusiveness which were outlined in chapter five and it will also require that the criticisms and shortcomings identified by those outside the tradition (as well as those which emerge from within it) are taken seriously.

8.3 An agenda for Catholic schools

As examples of further work to be done within Catholic schools on this account one might include the following. First, the principle of subsidiarity should be applied more consistently within the church and her schools. Second, pupils in Catholic schools could be better equipped to engage effectively in a pluralist society. Third, there must be exploration of how differentiation can be applied to the area of religious differences. Fourth, Catholic schools need to reflect more rigorously on the extent to which they display a preferential option for the poor, for example, with regard to pupil admissions and exclusions and provision for pupils with special needs. Fifth, Catholic schools should examine how successfully they develop in pupils the capacity for critical questioning, both of their own tradition and of practices and philosophies in the wider society. Sixth, they must question whether sufficient 'space' is provided and respect shown for the individual freedom of pupils (for whom, unlike their parents or the teachers, school is not a voluntary community).

Part of the agenda, then, will be the application of the principles outlined here to teaching and learning, for example, in differentiation, assessment, attention to special needs and the permeation of a Catholic perspective throughout the curriculum and in pastoral care. There will be implications in several other areas too. These include the management style adopted in Catholic schools, approaches to staff development, appraisal and inservice training, modes of communication, for example with parents and governors, and the outreach work of the school to parishes and the local community.[7] If the principles of subsidiarity and solidarity outlined in chapter seven are to have credibility, further investigation of the advantages and disadvantages of an overall coordination of Catholic education within England and Wales would be

beneficial as would further study of the possibilities of closer collaboration between Catholic schools.

8.4 Further research needed

I suggest four additional possible directions for building on the work carried out here. First, one could explore the implications of different models of the church for Catholic schools and for the working out in them of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness.[8] Second, one might investigate the bearing of this study on non-school forms and contexts for Catholic education in faith.[9] Third, the relevance of my treatment of distinctiveness and inclusiveness to Catholic schools in other countries could be considered. Fourth, other Christians, and indeed people of other religions, may wish to apply my approach in this study to their own forms of faith-based education.[10]

8.5 From promulgation to reception

In exposing part of the anatomy and dynamics of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education I have revealed some of the tensions which exist between a Catholic and a liberal approach to education. Catholic educators might accuse liberal educators of displaying too subjective a view of morality, too anthropological a view of nature, too narrow a view of rationality and too optimistic a view of human capacities. Liberal educators, on the other hand, might challenge Catholic educators to beware of theological imperialism in their curriculum theory, to guard against indoctrination in their classroom practice, to be more inclusive in pupil admissions and staff appointments and to encourage more critical thinking when reflecting on their tradition.

The issues explored also represent wider social tensions between preserving identity and avoiding exclusion and between universalism and particularism. However, the exploration here of the problematical nature and possible coherence of distinctiveness and inclusiveness has not been exhaustive; many aspects have not been adequately examined, for example, those relating to gender, poverty, and to cultural and religious differences.[11] Furthermore, even a more comprehensive treatment of distinctiveness and inclusiveness would still leave many unresolved issues which require attention in Catholic education, for example, issues relating to control, content, communication and evaluation. Nevertheless, I hope that my identification and treatment of one problematic area does cast light on the spirit, sensitivity, purpose and style which should pervade Catholic education, not only in schools but in other contexts.

My contention has been that the nurturing of inclusiveness and the promotion of the common good both can and should be well served by Catholic schools which are inspired by a distinctive philosophy of education. It has also been my contention that the distinctive approach to education which arises from a Catholic philosophy of life itself needs to be retrieved, preserved and articulated with clarity, confidence and charity by those who work in Catholic schools in order that it can be applied with greater consistency and effectiveness.

Until now the emphasis in 'official', normative statements on Catholic education has been on *promulgation* of church teaching: the assertion, reiteration, clarification and defence of its distinctive nature. It follows from the argument developed here that in future much more attention will have to be given, within Catholic educational circles, to *reception* of church teaching: to attending to and learning from the experience and perspectives of those 'on the ground', trying to put the principles into practice. If that

happens, then it will become clearer that distinctiveness and inclusiveness are integrally related, mutually qualifying and reciprocally interactive features of Catholic education.

Notes and references for chapter eight

[1]For a study of the need to recover and retell the Christian story in our culture, see Andrew Walker, *Telling the Story*, London, SPCK, 1996.

[2]"The only justification for a minority education is that the minority has something of value to communicate which is not to be found elsewhere." Christopher Dawson, *The Crisis in Western Education*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1961, p.153.

[3]On the Christian imperative to avoid exclusion, see Miroslav Volf, *Exclusion & Embrace*, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1996.

[4]On the emergence, within Catholicism, of a recognition of a greater attention to mediation between the global and the local, see Robert Schreiter, *The New Catholicity*, New York, Orbis, 1997.

[5]See Kevin Williams, 'Education and human diversity: the ethics of separate schooling revisited', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 46, no. 1, 1998, pp.26-39.

[6]David O'Brien, a leading analyst of the nature and role of Catholic Higher Education in the USA, reflects on these issues in 'A Catholic Future for Catholic Higher Education? The State of the Question' in *Catholic Education : A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, vol. 1, no. 1, September 1997, pp.37-50. See especially p.41. His comments have a wider application to Catholic education in general.

[7]On issues to be addressed in Catholic schools of the future, see *From Ideal To Action*, edited by Matthew Feheney, Dublin, Veritas, 1998, chapters 13 to 15 (by Andrew Greeley, Gerald Grace and Matthew Feheney respectively).

[8]See Appendix 2 on the contribution of Avery Dulles to our understanding of models of the church. Michael Hornsby-Smith brings out two very different forms of coherence within Catholicism in *Roman Catholic Beliefs in England: Customary Catholicism and transformations of religious authority*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 37. "[A] coherent belief system might stress the transcendent nature of the creator God, the hierarchical nature of the Church, papal authority, the priest as a sacred 'man apart', and the role of the layperson as subordinate to, and supportive of, that of the clergy. Conversely, a belief system which placed a greater emphasis on the immanent nature of God, the Church as the pilgrim 'people of God', the collegiality of the bishops, the full participation of lay people in all aspects of the mission of the Church, and an enabling style of priestly leadership, would also be coherent." Of course, my analysis of the relationship between distinctiveness and inclusiveness in Catholic education might have a bearing on the argument as to which of the two forms of coherence described by Hornsby-Smith is the more adequate reflection of Catholicism.

[9]As indicated in chapter one, note 1.

[10]In 1998 some Muslim schools have begun to receive official recognition and acceptance within the state system of education in the UK, as have some Christian schools which are not part of mainstream, institutional Christianity. These schools

will need to give serious consideration to many of the issues considered here: identity and diversity, distinctiveness and inclusiveness, tradition and inculturation, engaging with legitimate secular educational and social requirements and promotion of the common good.

[11]On feminism in the Catholic school, see the chapter of that title by Bernadette Flanagan in *From Ideal To Action.* On issues of social justice and on the potential impact of liberation theology for the practice of Catholic education, see Thomas Oldenski, *Liberation Theology and Critical Pedagogy in Today's Catholic Schools*, New York, Garland Publishing, 1997; and Thomas Groome, *Educating for Life*, Allen, Texas, Thomas More Press, 1998, chapter eight.

APPENDIX ONE

Compliance or Complaint: difficulties regarding teachers in Catholic schools

In an ideal situation, teachers in a Catholic school will be able to exemplify, to mediate and to explain the fullness of faith, as held by Catholic tradition, to bring out its various dimensions and to illustrate their bearing on other knowledge, concepts, skills, attitudes and practices. With regard to staff selection then, we might expect that, where possible, governing bodies would seek to appoint committed, practising Catholics who could embody, proclaim and facilitate the key principles of Catholic education and view of humanity. This practice would necessarily rule out equal employment and promotion opportunities for non-Catholic staff, for such staff would not be able, either in conscience or in practice, to offer that integral vision which is central to the Catholic approach to education, one which embraces 'daily life, curricular approaches, social structures and moral and religious conditions', nor could they operate as full partners with the home and the church in the joint and integrated task of witnessing to that vision.[1]

A.1 Expectations

Where it is sometimes difficult to attract sufficient Catholic teachers to vacant posts, governors often find themselves unsure as to whether to attach more weight to evidence of academic proficiency, to professional competence, or to commitment to a Catholic perspective on education. Since religious commitment does not guarantee competence as a teacher, and since they will want as high a quality of teacher as can be secured, it will not be obvious in advance how much weight will be given to active membership of the Catholic church, even where the selection committee is fully aware

of the importance of this for Catholic education. It is only reasonable to expect that candidates for posts would seek to ascertain the nature and the requirements of the work they are applying for and the kind of community they seek to join. There is also a heavy responsibility on the part of the school to ensure that it communicates clearly and comprehensively the information and guidance offered to potential new staff (including student teachers) about its expectations, especially those which go beyond what might be assumed to be generally part of a professional teacher's role.[2]

Let me pick out two types of expectations in Catholic schools which exceed those usually encountered by teachers, the first relating to responsibilities within school and the second relating to behaviour outside of school. Whatever the legal position with regard to their rights, for example, to withdraw from collective worship, there is an expectation that teachers within a Catholic school will contribute to the building up of the religious ethos of the school through attendance at, participation in and, where appropriate, even leadership of such acts of collective worship, thereby giving an example to the children of personal faith commitment and demonstrating the importance to them of worship. It would also be expected that, whatever their personal doubts and difficulties over particular aspects of the Church's teaching, teachers would forebear from making scathing and corrosive criticisms of Catholic principles in ways which might undermine confidence among pupils in the school's mission and purpose. Thus, there is a positive and a negative dimension to in-school expectation of staff. Efforts to establish guidelines for positive expectations, that is, how teachers in Catholic schools might contribute to the maintenance and development of the Catholic ethos, have been markedly less successful than those which focus on the negative, that is, on those types of behaviour which do something detrimental to the Catholic nature of the school.[3]

Normally there is a clear distinction made between the host of behaviours expected of a teacher in school, for example, as adult role model, exemplar of general moral norms and as a dedicated and caring professional, and the behaviour s/he might display in his or her private life. Some kinds of criminal activities are incompatible with the social role and associated responsibilities and expectations of teaching, for example, child abuse, dealing in drugs, or theft. Some kinds of activity, while not illegal, are likely to undermine confidence in the judgement or character of the teacher, for example, prostitution, excessive drinking, or becoming bankrupt. But a line can still be drawn between the private and the public life of a teacher.

This is less easy to delineate in the case of teachers who hold jobs in Catholic schools for they are expected to ensure that their behaviour outside schools does not undermine their more extended role of upholding the mission within school. There is considerable dispute at the moment as to the reasonableness and scope of the exemplar role of a teacher and when s/he puts this in jeopardy. There is also lack of clarity as to who is covered by such expectations: does it apply merely to currently practising Catholic teachers or does it extend beyond this category to others, for example, to lapsed Catholic teachers, who were appointed on the understanding that they would promote the Catholic vision of the school, or indeed to other teachers who agree to uphold the mission of the school and take up employment on that (implicit or explicit) understanding?

Problems arise here over justice, consistency and clarity of communication. There are also issues about how to balance the rights of teachers with the mission of the school. Teachers have rights to privacy, to freedom of conscience and of expression and the right not to be discriminated against. Yet, in certain circumstances, the full exercise of these rights will compromise the *raison d'etre* of the school. Teachers who

voluntarily accept posts in Catholic schools, provided that there has been the necessary communication, should expect that the exercise of their rights may need to be circumscribed in some ways so as to bring this exercise into harmony with the new responsibilities they have accepted.

Confusion can arise, too, over what a school permits and what it promotes, and the difference between the school's dual role of being both prophetic and pastoral, condemning certain kinds of behaviour while forgiving and accepting those who fall short (under the aspect of sin). There is a difference between people who find themselves in difficulties or in complex situations which are not in harmony with Catholic moral teaching, but do so with regret, sorrow and a recognition of their shortcomings and those whose behaviour contradicts the school's stance but who display - and feel - no such sense of wrongdoing. On the one hand, too strong a demand for perfection invites covering up, hypocrisy, accusations of elitism and is practically unsustainable; while, on the other hand, too great a readiness to live with compromise and ambiguity is pedagogically confusing and sells the mission short.

There are also difficulties about who decides which aspects of Catholic moral teaching are to be treated as crucial. Are sexual sins to be treated as of overriding importance when it comes to a judgement about whether the ethos of the school is being undermined? Or will other forms of behaviour, such as sarcasm, carelessness, greed, ruthlessness, disregard for people's sensitivities or failure to support the practice of prayer, personal rejection of religious practice also come under consideration?

James Day addresses some of the damaging side-effects of the attempt to develop a strong ethos within Catholic schools and to extend this beyond their borders. He speaks of a conspiracy of silence, a pedagogy of estrangement, a loss of voice for

some school members, and an unhealthy split between tradition and experience.[4] For Day the split between the public proclamations and the private lives of school members is inadequately attended to in Catholic schools, inducing a sense of unreality, a lack of attention to attempts on the part of students to name, describe and understand their experience, and a failure to question sufficiently rigorously the teachings of the tradition. In a sense, too much of what is external to students is taken for granted, while too little of what counts for them in their current stage of development is taken into account. As a result, the distancing and dispossession which follows leads to a failure to be inclusive in the way was suggested desirable in chapter.[5] The implication of Day's comments is that this need not and should not be the case, that it contradicts essential elements of the Church's own tradition and teaching.[5]

Day's remarks relate mainly to the potentially damaging effects for pupils of some aspects of Catholic school ethos. But we can see that they could apply also to the experience of teachers. While teachers in Catholic schools can scarcely complain if they are expected to display qualities required of teachers in other schools, for example, to be communicators of truth, transmitters of common values, skilled professionals and carers for children and young people, they may reject the notion that they should also function as models of the Christian life.[6] Yet if the teacher's personal example and commitment influence the pupils' response more than precept or the material they have to study, it is not surprising that in church schools, there will be an expectation that teachers will embody and witness to 'the more abundant life' aspired to by the Christian. As Newman says, "The general principles of any study you may learn by books at home; but the detail, the colour, the tone, the air, the life which makes it live in us, you must catch all these from those in whom it lives already."[7]

This applies to any area of study, but we can expect to it to apply to a much greater degree in the case of religion, which is not meant to be confined to a section of life but to be all-pervasive. Such all-pervasiveness has to be demonstrated by people who do literally carry it forward into every area of the curriculum and who let it permeate all aspects of school life. In that way Cardinal Manning's requirement will be met: "Christian training ...may not be taken in doses once a week, nor even once a day but like the salt that seasons our food it must be in the food at every meal...it must be in history, geography, reading lessons, in the manners and examples of the teachers - in his or her very eyes."[8] If pupils do not see that religion makes a difference to people both on and off-duty, in their mode of operation, in their relationships, decision-making and priorities, then they will soon judge that the claims and promises of religion far exceed their capacity to deliver - in both scope and depth.

A.2 Obstacles to meeting these expectations

If there are higher expectations of teachers working in Catholic schools, in terms of moral behaviour and religious commitment, it does not follow, however, that an appropriate way to promote such standards is the application of the law or other forms of coercion. There are two reasons for this, one pragmatic, the other a matter of principle. First, given the dispersal of powers and responsibilities in Catholic education, which include the local Bishop, parents, trustees, governors, headteacher, the local education authority, the Funding Agency and the Department for Education and Employment, and given the plurality of fiscal and constitutional/legal arrangements for Catholic schools, including independent, special agreement, voluntary aided and grant maintained, consistency in applying sanctions would be very difficult to establish.

The situation is made even more complex in the face of differing interpretations of their respective rights and responsibilities by all the parties concerned in different parts of the country. For example, it is not always clear *in practice* how one should balance the respective weight of parental, episcopal and governor rights with regard to staff selection, pupil admissions or curriculum provision, even when canon law or the law of the land is unambiguous. Uniform application of law, whether church or secular law, does not have uniform effects, nor is it seen in exactly the same light everywhere. Perceptions about the appropriateness of teachers' behaviour in school and beyond it differ. So too do perceptions as to what it is appropriate to take into account with regard to teachers' behaviour, (where should the public/private division be made? and which aspects of a person's life are 'off-limits' as far as employers are concerned?). Local custom and culture, ecclesiastical politics and prevailing models of church, the levels of support and advice available from diocesan schools commissions and the Catholic Education Service, together with the degree of ease or difficulty experienced by the schools in attracting committed Catholic teachers, all make a significant difference as to what action is thought necessary or possible when teachers' behaviour fails to match expectations.[9] They can also make important differences to the nature of these expectations. For example, is what is required of a teacher as a model of faithful practitioner exactly the same in a school which gives nurture of faith the highest priority as in one which attaches more importance to service to the poor or in one where a counter-cultural prophetic stance is advocated?

Practically it has proved almost impossible to bring about any kind of consistent approach to insisting upon the teacher as a model of faithful or moral behaviour, especially for those who are not headteachers or teachers of religious education, where there is less resistance to the notion that such people can be expected to act as

models of the school's mission. The complexity of the situation is compounded by the presence within Catholic schools of significant numbers of staff who are not Catholic.[10] The greater the pluralism among teachers the harder it is to promote a predominantly Catholic approach to the teacher as example without putting in jeopardy either the employment rights of teachers guaranteed in law or the ability of Catholic schools to secure enough teachers to offer a sufficiently broad curriculum. Sanctions might end up being applied selectively against those who accept the Catholic 'label', which would lead to accusations of injustice if certain kinds of behaviour are subject to censure if carried out by some staff but not if carried out by others. Whether or not sanctions are carried out with a degree of laxity, with rigorous uniformity, or with sensitive and flexible responsiveness to the particularities of each case, it seems that their exercise is likely to call their very existence into question and bring the school which employs them into disrepute. This leads us into the second objection.

The second reason for suggesting that the application of legal sanctions may not be the best way to promote the exemplification by teachers of the ideals of Catholic education is rather different from the pragmatic one just outlined. There appears to be something contradictory in establishing separate schools based on a Gospel for which the principle of forgiveness - endless forgiveness - is a constitutive element and then employing means which condemn those who fall short of ideals. Schools, like churches, are not perfect societies. They have to live with less than the best performance and practice from their members, exercising compassion and maintaining forbearance even as they strive to attain high standards of achievement and behaviour. If certain kinds of behaviour can be compelled, neither faith nor morality can be imposed. These require free response.

Judgements about the rightness or wrongness of behaviour in general and judgements about the degree of guilt to be attributed to particular people for specific shortcomings are closely related but are not identical. Christians are told to hate the sin but to love the sinner. We do not have a divine insight into but only a limited perspective on the motivations and pressures on people who act in ways that contradict the norms implicit in church schools. It is very difficult to ascertain when weeds have grown so abundantly that they are choking the very possibility of life out of the crop. It is even more difficult to be confident that we can separate out the irredeemably bad from the less bad or the good. Too great a readiness to root out the non-conforming or those who give negative witness directly contradicts the teaching of Jesus himself, who, when asked by a disciple if they should weed out the darnel, replied "No, because when you weed out the darnel you might pull up the wheat with it. Let them both grow till the harvest."[11] Nor is there any Gospel warrant for the enforcement of true religion.[12]

In the last two paragraphs I have suggested that some actions which might be carried out in order to protect a school's ideals from contamination themselves contradict principles which are part of the central core of Catholicism. Of course, it has not been the case historically that the church has refrained from using secular power to promote its cause. Excessive force and cruel methods have been part of a catalogue of intolerance at various times in the last two thousand years. Yet it can be shown that, while sometimes understandable in terms of the mentality of the period, and while there might have been an attempt in some way to defend such actions on the basis of some scriptural text, repression and harsh treatment of those who fall short are out of harmony with the way of Jesus and contradict his teaching in essential ways.

A.3 Upholding ethos while maintaining tolerance

What I have not suggested, however, is that we are obliged to turn a blind eye to behaviour which undermines the school's ethos or mission or that we should excuse it or treat it as of little account. If I forbear from exercising all the powers at my disposal to prevent something happening, this may be for a number of reasons. I may feel 'there, but for the grace of God, go I', sensing the vulnerability of all of us to weakness and temptation and wishing to avoid on my side any impression of complacency or security of achievement or success. I may wish, by refraining from condemnation, to elicit forbearance and forgiveness for my own shortcomings. I may wish to refrain from premature judgement, acknowledging that perhaps I am not in full possession of the relevant facts. I may wish to avoid condemning someone, which might imply that they were irredeemable. I may refrain from action because I fear the consequences of bringing fully into the light something which at present may be known to very few, perhaps taking a prudential view about defending the public image and reputation of the institution (and its members) against unnecessary adverse publicity. I may simply hope that maintaining good relations and a positive approach to someone will eventually win them around to my way of thinking, even if this means I have to accept some temporary retreat or defeat on a matter of principle. In this case I aim to 'keep the conversation going' rather than to close it down. These actions - or decisions to refrain from action - might be thought of as expressions of tolerance but not of neutrality.

Tolerance does not imply neutrality. In fact the exercise of tolerance depends on a judgement that something wrong or less than the ideal presents itself as a challenge; otherwise the decision not to suppress it does not even arise as an option.[13] When I tolerate something I put up with what is wrong (in my view) for a variety of reasons,

such as those given above, but principally for the sake of some good equal to or greater than that threatened at the moment by the offending behaviour which is the current focus of my attention. If I did not have convictions I would not think the behaviour important or significantly wrong. Far from tolerance relying upon weakly-held views and an abdication of moral judgment, it rests upon strongly held convictions about a variety of goods and a decision to pursue one or more of these goods in a different way, so that short-term and damaging means which would obstruct the path towards longer-term and more embracing ends are not taken.[14]

When I tolerate something, my view of the greater good leads me to decide not to suppress lesser evils; it does not allow me to ignore such evils, much less to pretend that they do not exist. As Budziszewski says, "the specific virtue of tolerance has to do with the fact that sometimes we put up with things we rightly consider mistaken, wrong, harmful, offensive, or in some other way not worth approval."[15] But we do not act on our disapproval for any or all of the reasons given above or because we believe that to do so might have harmful side-effects.[16] We not want to produce "cravenness, poverty of imagination, helplessness, self-pity, bleakness, a tendency to manipulate, and a strange union of resentment and obsequiousness" as a result of our enforcement of the right, for none of these characteristics assist in the promotion of virtue.[17] An authoritarian educational ethos could endanger the development or best use of the very powers we hope to nurture, both among pupils and among colleagues: compassion, trust, creativity (which involves risk-taking), choice and decision-making. With regard to professional staff, "winning their support is far more a matter of persuasion and politics than mandates and mission statements."[18] This support will come about less through managerial control than through inspirational and effective witness.

Notes and references for Appendix 1

This is a slightly modified version of an article, with the same title, published in *Irish Educational Studies*, vol. 17, April 1998.

[1]V. Alan McClelland, in *The Contemporary Catholic School*, (*CCS*) edited by T.H. McLaughlin, B. O'Keeffe and J. O'Keefe, London Falmer Press, 1996, p.157. He quotes Patrick Kelly, then Bishop of Salford: "Nor can we be satisfied with a situation where each teacher is competent in a particular discipline but does not share in an agreed vision of the whole task."

[2]The Catholic Education Service, London, 1995, has produced a useful guidebook which addresses these issues, called *Induction.*

[3]James Arthur, 'Teaching and Employment Conditions in Catholic Schools: Principles and Practice', *Law & Justice*, No. 124/125, Hilary/Easter, 1995, pp.40-53 and *The Ebbing Tide*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1995, p.192. Arthur points out that the Catholic Education Council revised the contract for Catholic teachers in 1981 by adding clause 4 (III) (a) to the effect that that the teacher agrees : "to have regard to the Roman Catholic character of the school and not to do anything in any way detrimental or prejudicial to the interests of the same." Later attempts to incorporate the following different wording met such opposition that it was withdrawn: "The teacher should endeavour to maintain and develop the Catholic character of the school, in accordance with the direction of the governors and, subject thereto, the directions given by the headteacher." See also T.H. McLaughlin, 'The teacher as an example in a Catholic school' [unpublished paper].

[4]James Day, 'Recognition and Responsivity : Unlearning the Pedagogy of Estrangement for a Catholic Moral Education,' *CCS*, pp.162-173.

[5]The need to respect the religious freedom and the personal conscience of students (and their families) is emphasised in *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, from the Congregation for Catholic Education, London, CTS, 1988 as are the tasks of ensuring that there is no confusion between offering and imposing a teaching and that the individual needs of students are attended to. (pp.5, 11.)

[6]See Anthony McDonnell, *The Ethos of Catholic Voluntary Secondary Schools*, PhD thesis, University College, Dublin, 1995, pp.258-259

[7]J.H. Newman, (*Historical Sketches*, vol. III), quoted by John Britt in *The Literary & Educational Effects of the Thought of John Henry Newman*, edited by Michael Sundermeier & Robert Churchill, Lampeter, The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995, p.213.

[8]Cardinal Manning, quoted by Kevin Nichols,' Theology and the Dual System', unpublished paper for International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996, p.4. As James Arthur reminds us, "Bishop Beck thought it was more important *who* taught rather than *what* was taught." Arthur, *The Ebbing Tide*, p.185.

[9]I am not referring here to professional incompetence or to disciplinary matters which might have to be confronted in any kind of school. Even in these areas there has

been, until very recently, a huge reluctance to tackle underperformance. One of the effects of local management of schools has been a much greater willingness to address poor performance by staff, although such practice is still not widespread.

[10]In 1995 12.8% of teachers in Catholic primary schools in England and Wales were not Catholic. The parallel figure for secondary schools is 42.4%. Figures (extracted from diocesan returns) were provided for the author in July 1996 by Margaret Smart, Director of the Catholic Education Service. James Arthur's *The Ebbing Tide* maps out in great detail a range of policy issues for Catholic education which have been the focus of conflict between the various parties, including parents, bishops, school governors and national government.

[11]See Matthew 13: 24-30.

[12]John 18: 33-38, especially verse 36, where, on being questioned by Pilate, Jesus says that his kingdom is not of this world and that if it were, his followers would take up arms for it. Although (in Matthew 22:21) Jesus does not say which things are Caesar's and which belong to God, he does clearly distinguish the two kingdoms and what is appropriate for each.

[13]Toleration is not an expression of scepticism. It is founded on judgement about truth and value and commitment to this judgement. "Without commitment, tolerance is neither difficult nor something to be proud of. Tolerance might be rather like simply not caring enough to mind what people believe. On the other hand, commitment without tolerance is something akin to bigotry. Each virtue needs the other." Les Burwood, 'How Should Schools Respond to the Plurality of Values in a Multi-cultural Society?', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 30, no. 2, November 1996, p.419.

[14]However, the view that some forms of intolerance are necessary for the pursuit of educational practice is put by Bruce Suttle in 'The Need for and Inevitability of Educational Intolerance', *Philosophy of Education*, University of Illinois, 1996, pp.448-455. He says (p.454) "if education's goal is the development of a particular kind of person, and if tolerance involves respecting people as they are, then succeeding in our educational goals requires being intolerant of certain ways of thinking, valuing, and acting." Very much in harmony with this line of thought, Mark Holmes asks: "Is a teacher who lets habitual dishonesty pass, on the grounds that the child comes from a family where dishonesty is normal and accepted, being tolerant or unprofessional?..To what extent is the idea of tolerance used as an ideological weapon against standards, high expectations of students, discipline, order, rigour, and religion? ...Today's school is quite as likely to be overly tolerant of violence, dishonesty, poor work, laziness, as it is to be intolerant." Holmes, *Educational Policy for the Pluralist Democracy*, London, Falmer Press, 1992, pp.94-96.

[15]J. Budziszewski, *True Tolerance*, New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers, 1992, p.7.

[16]Arthur Lovejoy describes the need to temper perfectionism with prudence in the following way. "The delicate and difficult art of life is to find, in each new turn of experience, the *via media* between two extremes:...to have and apply standards, and yet to be on guard against their tendency to blind us to the diversities of concrete

situations and to previously unrecognized values; to know when to tolerate, when to embrace, and when to fight." Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being*, quoted by John Kekes in *The Morality of Pluralism*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1993, p.17.

[17]*Ibid.*, p.92.

[18]David O'Brien, 'A Catholic Future for Catholic Higher Education? The State of the Question', *Catholic Education*, vol. 1, no. 1, September 1997, p.44.

APPENDIX TWO

Avery Dulles

Avery Dulles, one of America's leading Catholic theologians, has provided an extremely influential summary of a changing ecclesiology in *Models of the Church*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1974. Dulles analyses models of the church as institution, as mystical communion, as herald, as sacrament, and as servant. He brings out very clearly the strengths, weaknesses and attendant implications of each model. Each of these models has particular insights; but each of them is also open to distortion and imbalance if treated in isolation from the others.

For example, those who adopt the institutional model can fall into the danger of identifying the church only with its formal structures; they can be doctrinaire, rigid, conformist and, by mistaking the official church for God, even idolatrous. The herald model may oversimplify the process of salvation, conveying an impression that the *only* task of the church is the proclamation of the gospel. The mystical communion model may raise expectations about its life which are impossible to satisfy and may, through lack of emphasis on formal structure, lead to confusion when there are disputes to be settled. The sacramental model can be heavily theological, hard to communicate, undervalue structure and attend insufficiently to its mandate for mission. The servant model can run the dangers of reducing the gospel to good works, uncritically accepting secular values and neglecting the spiritual dimension of church life.

Dulles suggests (p.181.) seven criteria which might be applied in an attempt to evaluate each one of these models: its basis in scripture, its basis in Christian tradition, its capacity to give church members a sense of their corporate identity and mission, its

tendency to foster the virtues and values generally admired by Christians, its correspondence with the religious experience of people today, its theological fruitfulness and its fruitfulness in enabling church members to relate successfully to those outside their own group.

For an extension of the exploration of a plurality of models and approaches to theological thinking, see also Dulles's *Models of Revelation*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1983. Here he examines revelation as doctrine, as history, as inner experience, as dialectical presence and as new awareness. See also Dulles's *The Assurance of Things Hoped For*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1994. In this work Dulles provides a magisterial overview of the differing ways faith has been understood throughout history, exposes several models of faith, such as propositional, transcendental, fiducial, affective-experiential, obediential, praxis and personalist. He then analyses these systematically in terms of the nature and object of faith, its grounding, properties, development and implications for our understanding of the relationship between faith and salvation.

I would contend that the growing acceptance of the value of a plurality of dimensions and approaches to theological concepts and a better understanding of their respective strengths, weaknesses, inter-relationships and implications, owes much to the careful and clear mapping provided by Dulles over the last thirty years. Even where he has not been read directly, much of his thinking has been absorbed indirectly into the categories and mindsets of theologians, both lay and clerical, who have been influential in Catholic educational circles, rather as, in a parallel manner, some of the key categories and insights of Marx, Darwin, Nietzsche and Freud inhabit much of our secular thinking, despite the fact that few have read their works.

In the context of this thesis, Dulles has clarified important aspects of the distinctiveness of Catholicism. In *The Catholicity of the Church* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985, p.10.) he lists as distinctively Catholic features:"the Incarnation, the essential goodness of nature, the universal expansiveness of the Church, its inner unity, its continuous life, the reliability of sacramental mediation, the authority of the hierarchical ministry, and the truth of dogmatic teaching." On p.14. Dulles reminds us of the five reasons given in the period of the early church by Cyril of Jerusalem (in his Catechetical Lectures) for describing the Church as catholic: "it extends to the ends of the earth; it teaches all the doctrine needed for salvation; it brings every sort of human being under obedience; it cures every kind of sin; and it possesses every form of virtue." Dulles himself (p.30.) refers to four dimensions of Catholicism: (a) its height, Catholicity from above, related to or in communion with the fullness of God in Christ, the divine component; (b) its depth, or its rootedness in the natural and the human; (c) its breadth, or spatial universality; and (d) its length, or temporal extension.

In a more recent article ('Criteria of Catholic theology', *Communio*, 22, 1995, pp.303-315) Dulles suggests fifteen criteria should be applied if one wishes to assess whether a theology is to be considered truly Catholic. I would summarise his criteria as embracing the following: (1) reason within faith, so that in the harmony between faith and reason both fideism and rationalism are avoided; (2) the knowability of God, (3) the catholicity of Christ, that is, Christ is treated as the centrepiece of creation, the person in whom all things were created and in whom all things hang together; (4) missionary universalism; (5) ecclesial context; (6) communion with Rome; (7) ecumenism; (8) differentiated unity, that is, preserving unity without being sectarian, using the gifts of different individuals and the traditions of different cultures; (9) continuity with the past; (10) sacramentality and worship; (11) sense of the faithful;

(12) acceptance of authority; (13) scripture within tradition; (14) fidelity to the magisterium (this does not rule out discernment of the different weight to be attributed to different pronouncements, nor about formulations or the force of arguments); (15) association with the magisterium, which involves maintaining solidarity with pastoral leaders and sharing in the mission of the church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, W (ed) *The Documents of Vatican II*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1967

Achtemeier, P. Mark, `The Truth of Tradition : Critical Realism in the Thought of Alasdair MacIntyre and T.F Torrance`, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol.47, No.3, 1994, pp.355-374

Akhtar, S 'Muslims and their schools', *The Tablet*, 14/2/98, p.208.

Almond, B, `Alasdair MacIntyre : the virtue of tradition`, *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, vol. 7, No. 3, 1990, pp.99-103

Amilburu, M, (ed) *Education, the State & the Multicultural Challenge*, Pamplona, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1996

Anglican - Roman Catholic International Commission, *Life in Christ*, London, Catholic Truth Society and Church House Publishing, 1994

Angus, L.B., *Continuity and Change in Catholic Schooling*, London, Falmer, 1988

Archard, D, *Children: Rights and Childhood*, London, Routledge, 1993

Archard, D, (ed) *Philosophy and Pluralism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996

Archer, A *The Two Catholic Churches*, London, SCM, 1986

Aretin, K.O. von *The Papacy in the Modern World*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1970

Arthur, J 'Catholic Responses to the 1988 Education Reform Act : Problems of Authority and Ethos', *British Journal of Religious Education*, vol. 13, No. 3, 1991, pp.181-189

Arthur, J 'The Ambiguities of Catholic Schooling', *Westminster Studies in Education*, vol. 19, 1994, pp.65-77

Arthur, J 'Admissions to Catholic Schools : principles and practice', *British Journal of Religious Education*, vol. 17, No. 1, 1994, pp.35-45

Arthur, J 'Teaching and Employment Conditions in Catholic Schools', *Law & Justice*, no.124/125, 1995, pp.40-53

Arthur, J *The Ebbing Tide*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1995

Arthur, J 'A Catholic Policy on Teachers?', *Educational Management & Administration*, vol. 23, No. 4, 1995, pp.254-259

Arthur, J 'Government Education Policy and Catholic Voluntary Aided Schools 1979-1994', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 21, No. 4, 1995, pp.447-455

Ashraf, S. A and Paul Hirst (eds) *Religion and Education : Islamic & Christian Approaches* Cambridge, The Islamic Academy, 1994

Ashton, E & Watson, B (eds) *Society in Conflict: The Value of Education*, The University of Hull (*Aspects of Education*, no 51), 1994

Aspin, D, `Church Schools, religious education and the multi-ethnic community`, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1983, pp.229-240

Astley, J and Day, D (eds) *The Contours of Christian Education*, Great Wakering, Essex, McCrimmons, 1992

Astley, J and Francis, L (eds) *Critical Perspectives on Christian Education*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1994

Astley, J and Francis, L (eds) *Christian Theology and Religious Education : Connections & Contradictions*, London, SPCK, 1996
Astley, J and Francis, L and Crowder, C (eds) *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation*, Leominster, Gracewing, 1996
Aviram, A, 'Autonomy and Commitment : compatible ideals', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1995, pp.61-73
Badley, K, 'The Faith/Learning Integration Movement in Christian Higher Education : Slogan or Substance?', *Journal of Christian Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, 1994, pp.17-33
Badley, K, 'Two 'Cop-Outs' in Faith-Learning Integration', *Spectrum*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1996, pp.105-118
Ball, S, *Education Reform*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1994
Ball, S Gewirtz, S and Bowe, R, *Markets, Choice and Equity in Education*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1995
Bailey, C *Beyond the Present and Particular*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984
Barmann, L (ed) *The Letters of Baron Friedrich von Hügel & Professor Norman Kemp Smith*, New York, Fordham University Press, 1981
Barmann, L 'Friedrich von Hügel as Modernist and as more than Modernist', *The Catholic Historical Review*, 1989, pp.211-232.
Barnes, M *Religions in Conversation*, London, SPCK, 1989
Barnett, R *The Limits of Competence*, London, Open University Press, 1994
Barrow, R and White, P (eds) *Beyond Liberal Education*, London, Routledge, 1993
Barrow, R 'Denominational Schools and Public Schooling', *Interchange*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1993, pp.225-232
Baum, G *Man Becoming*, New York, Herder and Herder, 1970
Baxter, M and Bauerschmitt, F '*Eruditio* without *religio*? : The dilemma of Catholics in the academy?', *Communio*, vol.XXII, no. 2, 1995, pp.284-302
Bayldon, M '*Gravissimum Educationis* 30 years on', *New Blackfriars*, March, pp.131-136, 1996, pp.131-136
Beavis, A and Ross Thomas, A 'Metaphor as Storehouses of Expectation', *Educational Management & Administration*, vol. 24, no. 1, 1996, pp.93-106
Bellah, R. et al *Habits of the Heart*, London, Hutchinson, 1988
Bellah, R et al *The Good Society*, New York, Vintage Books, Random House, 1992
Benestad, B 'Catholicism & American Public Philosophy', *Review of Politics*, 53 (Fall), 1991, pp.691-711
Bernadin, J 'The Common Ground Project - Called to be Catholic', *Doctrine & Life*, vol. 46, October, 1996, pp.490-496
Berger, P *The Sacred Canopy*, New York, Doubleday, 1969
Berger, P *A Rumour of Angels*, London, Penguin, 1970
Berger, P *The Social Construction of Reality*, London, Penguin, 1971
Berger, P, with Berger, B and Kellner, H *The Homeless Mind*, London, Penguin, 1974
Berger, P *The Heretical Imperative*, London, Collins, 1980
Bernstein, R, *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1983

Bishops` Conference of England and Wales, *Catholic Schools and Other Faiths*, Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1997
Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *Religious Education : Curriculum Directory for Catholic Schools*, London, The Catholic Education Service, 1996
Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *A Struggle for Excellence : Catholic Secondary Schools in Urban Poverty Areas*, London, Catholic Education Service, 1997
Blake, N 'Church Schools, Religious Education & the multi-ethnic community: a reply to David Aspin', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1983, pp.241-250
Bliss, F *Understanding Reception*, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press, 1994
Blondel, M *La Philosophie et L'Esprit Chretien*, vol. II Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1946
Blondel, M *Exigences Philosophiques du Christianisme*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1950
Blondel, M *Les Premiers Ecrits de Maurice Blondel*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1956
Blondel, M *Blondel- Laberthonnière: Correspondance Philosophique*, Paris, Éditions du Seuil, 1961
Blondel, M *Carnets Intimes*, vol. I, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1961
Blondel, M *Carnets Intimes*, vol. II, Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1966
Blondel, M *Letter on Apologetics and History and Dogma*, edited by A. Dru and I Trethowan, London, Harvill Press, 1964 (reissued Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1995)
Blondel, M *L'Action*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1973
Board of Education of the General Synod of the Church of England, *Tomorrow is Another Country: education in a post-modern world*, The National Society, London, 1996
Boff, L *Church; Charism & Power*, London, SCM Press, 1985
Bottery, M `Education and the Convergence of Management Codes`, *Educational Studies*, vol.20, no.3, 1994, pp.329-343
Boys, M *Educating in Faith : Maps and Visions*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1989
Boys, M (ed) *Educating for Citizenship & Discipleship*, New York, Pilgrim Press, 1989
Bradford, J *Caring for the Whole Child*, London, The Children's Society, 1995
Brennan, J *The Christian Management of Catholic Schools*, Northampton, The Becket Press, 1994
Bridges, D & McLaughlin, T (eds) *Education in the Market Place*, London, Falmer Press, 1994
Brinkman, B 'Due Veduta di Roma', *The Heythrop Journal*, vol. 37, no. 2, April 1996, pp.176-192
Bruner, J, *The Culture of Education*, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press, 1996
Bryk, A, Lee, V and Holland, P (eds) *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*, London, Harvard University Press, 1993

Buber, M *Between Man and Man*, London, Fontana, 1974
Buchman, M and Floden, R. (eds) *Detachment and Concern*, London, Cassell, 1993
Budziszewski, J, *True Tolerance : Liberalism and the Necessity of Judgment*, New Brunswick, New Jersey, Transaction Publishers, 1992
Buetow, H, *The Catholic School Its Roots, Identity, & Future*, New York, Crossroad, 1988
Buhlmann, W *With Eyes To See*, Slough, St Paul Publications, 1990
Burns, G *The Frontiers of Catholicism : The Politics of Ideology in a Liberal World*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1994
Burtonwood, N, 'Beyond Culture: a Reply to Mark Halstead', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 30, no 2, 1996, pp.295-299
Burwood, L 'How Should Schools Respond to the Plurality of Values in a Multi-cultural Society?', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 30, no. 3, 1996, pp.415-427
Bush, T and West-Burnham-West, J (eds) *Principles of Educational Management*, Harlow, Longman, 1994
Cahill, L.S., 'The Catholic Tradition: Religion, Morality, & the Common Good', *The Journal of Law & Religion*, vol.50, no.1, 1987, pp.75-94
Cahill, W, 'Why Greenfield? The Relevance of T.B. Greenfield`s Theories to Catholic Education`, *Educational Management & Administration*, vol. 22, no. 4, 1994, pp.251-259
Caldecott, and Morrill, J (eds) *Eternity in Time*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1997
Callan, E 'The Great Sphere : Education against Servility', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1997, pp.221-232
Callan, E *Creating Citizens*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997
Carey, P & Muller, E *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition*, New York, Crossroad, 1997
Carmody, B 'A Context for the Catholic Philosophy of Education', *Lumen Vitae*, vol.36, 1981, pp.45-61
Carney, P 'Black pride on Moss Side', *The Tablet*, 11/10/97, p.1294
Carr, D `Education & Values`, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. XXXIX, no. 3, 1991, pp.244-259
Carr, D *Educating the Virtues*, London, Routledge, 1991
Carr, D `Questions of Competence`, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. XXXXI, no. 3, 1993, pp.253-271
Carr, D `Spiritual Education : Towards a Distinctive Conception`,*Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 21, no.1, 1995, pp.83-98
Carr, D *The Moral Role of the Teacher*, Edinburgh, Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum, 1996
Carr, D 'Songs of Immanence & Transcendence', *Oxford Review of Education*, vol.22, no.4, 1996, pp.457-463
Carr, D 'Rival Conceptions of Spiritual Education', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 30, no. 2, 1996, pp.159-178
Carr, T *Newman and Gadamer*, Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press, 1996

Carr, W 'Education and Democracy: confronting the postmodern challenge', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1995, pp.75-91
Carr, W and Naish, M *Education and the Struggle for Democracy*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1996
Carr, W 'Professing Education in a Postmodern Age', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1997, pp.309-327
Carter, S *The Culture of Disbelief*, New York, Doubleday, 1994
Cassidy, E 'Irish Educational Policy in a Philosophical Perspective: The Legacy of Liberalism', in *Religion, Education and the Constitution*, edited by Dermot Lane, Dublin, The Columba Press, 1992
Cassidy, E (ed) *Faith & Culture in the Irish Context*, Dublin, Veritas Publications, 1996
Catechism of the Catholic Church, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994
Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales, *The Sign We Give*, Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1995
Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales, *Education in Catholic Schools and Colleges: Principles, Practices and Concerns*, Manchester, Gabriel Communications, 1996
Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales, *The Common Good and Catholic Social Teaching*, Manchester, Gabriel Comunications, 1996
Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales, *Religious Education: Curriculum Directory for Catholic Schools*, London, 1996
Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales, *Catholic Schools & Other Faiths*, London, 1997
Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales, *Partners in Mission*, Chelmsford, Matthew James Publishing, 1997
Catholic Bishops Conference of England and Wales, *The Common Good in Education*, London, CES, 1997
Catholic Education Service, *Governing a Catholic School*(1 & 2), London, 1992, 1994
Catholic Education service, *The Mission Statement into Action*, London, 1992
Catholic Education Service, *Evaluating the Distinctive Nature of a Catholic School*, (3rd edition), London, 1994
Catholic Education Service, *The Inspection of Catholic Schools*, London, 1994
Catholic Education Service, *Social and Moral Education in Catholic Schools*, 1994
Catholic Education Service, *Education in Sexuality*, London, 1994
Catholic Education Service, *What Are We to Teach?*, London, 1994
Catholic Education Service, *Induction of Teachers*, London, CES, 1995
Catholic Education Service, *Spiritual & Moral Development Across the Curriculum*, London, 1995
Catholic Education Service, *Quality of Education in Catholic Secondary Schools*, London, 1995
Catholic Education Service, *Partnership in the Training of Teachers for Catholic Schools*, 1995

Catholic Education Service, *Learning from OFSTED and Diocesan Inspection and The Distinctive Nature of Education in Catholic Primary and Secondary Schools*, London, 1996
Catholic Education Service, *Differentiation: A Catholic Response*, London, 1997
Chadwick, O *The Secularization of the European Mind*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1978
Chadwick, P *Schools of Reconciliation*, London, Cassell, 1994
Chadwick, P *Shifting Alliances : Church and State in English Education*, London, Cassell, 1997
Chardin, T de *Lettres Intimes a Auguste Valensin, Bruno de Solage, Henri de Lubac, Andre Ravier, 1919-1955*, edited by H. de Lubac, Paris, 1974
Chesterton, G.K 'The New Case for Catholic Schools' in *The Common Man*, London, 1950
Cock, A *A Critical Examination of Von Hugel's Philosophy of Religion*, London, distributed by Hugh Rees, no publisher indicated, 1948
Coleman, J, *High School Achievement*, New York, Basic Books, 1982
Coleman, J, *Public and Private High Schools*, New York, Basic Books, 1987
Comby, J with Macculloch, D *How to Read Church History*, vol. 2, London, SCM Press, 1989
Commission for Racial Equality, *Schools of Faith. Religious Schools in a Multicultural Society*, London, 1990
Congar, Y *Tradition and the Life of the Church*, translated by A.N. Woodrow, London, Burns & Oates, 1964
Congregation for the Clergy, *General Directory for Catechesis*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1997
Conrad, R, *The Catholic Faith: A Dominican's Vision*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1994
Cooling, T, *A Christian Vision for State Education*, London, SPCK, 1994
Cooper, D, 'Strategies of Power: Legislating Worship and Religious Education' in *The Impact of Michel Foucault on the Social Sciences and Humanities*, edited by Moya Lloyd & Andrew Thacker, Macmillan, 1997
Council for Catholic Maintained Schools, *Life to the Full : A Vision for Catholic Education*, Dublin, Veritas, 1996
Coutagne, M.J., *L'Action. Une dialectique du salut*, Paris, Beauchesne, 1994
Coutagne, M.J *Maurice Blondel, Professeur*, forthcoming
Crosby, J, *The Selfhood of the Human Person*, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of America Press, 1996
Curran, C, *The Living Tradition of Catholic Moral Theology*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1992
Curran, C 'The Catholic Identity of Catholic Institutions', *Theological Studies*, vol. 58, No. 1,March 1997, pp.90-108
Darling-Smith, B (ed) *Can Virtue Be Taught?*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1993
Davie, G *Religion in Britain Since 1945: Believing Without Belonging*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1994

Davies, B and West-Burnham, J (eds) *Reengineering and Total Quality in Schools*, London, Pitman, 1997
Davies, B and Ellison, L *School Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*, London, Routledge, 1997
Davies, Brian *The Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992
Dawson, C *The Crisis of Western Education*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1961
Dent, N *The Moral Psychology of Virtue*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984
Dent, R *Faith of Our Fathers: Roman Catholic Schools in a Multi-Faith Society*, Coventry Education Department, 1992
Department for Education (& Welsh Office), *Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs*, 1994
Department for Education, Circular 6/94: *The Organisation of Special Educational Provision*, 1994
Donovan, P 'The Intolerance of Religious Pluralism', *Religious Studies*, vol.29, no.2, 1993, pp.217-230
Doohan, L *The Lay-Centered Church*, Minneapolis, Winston Press, 1984
Douglass, R.B. 'Public Philosophy & Contemporary Pluralism', *Thought*, 64, December, 1989, pp.344-361
Douglass, R.B.*et al.* (eds), *Liberalism and the Good*, New York, Routledge, 1990
Douglass, R B. and Hollenbach, D (eds), *Catholicism and Liberalism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994
Duffy, S *The Graced Horizon*, Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 1992
Dulles, A *Models of the Church*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1974
Dulles, A *Models of Revelation*, Dublin, Gill & macmillan, 1983
Dulles, A *The Catholicity of the Church*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985
Dulles, A *Assurance of Things Hoped For*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1994
Dulles, A 'Criteria of Catholic theology', *Communio*, vol.XXII, no.2, 1995, pp.303-315
Dunne, J 'The Catholic School & Civil Society : exploring the tensions', in *The Catholic School in Contemporary Society*, The Conference of Major Religious Superiors, Dublin, 1991
Dunne, J *Back to the Rough Ground: 'Phronesis' & 'Techne' in Modern Philosophy & in Aristotle*, University of Notre Dame Press, 1993
Dunne, J 'Philosophies of the Self and the Scope of Education', in Papers of the Philosophy of education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1995, pp.170-180
Dupre, L, 'Catholic Education and the Predicament of Modern Culture', *Living Light*, vol.23, 1987, pp.295-305
Dwyer, J *Catholic Schools and Catholic Social principles : a comparative study of Australia, England & Wales , & the USA*, PhD thesis, London University Institute of Education, 1991
Dwyer, J & Montgomery, E.L. (eds) *The New Dictionary of Catholic Social Thought*, Collegeville, Minnesota, Liturgical Press, 1994

Dykstra, C *Vision & Character*, New York, Paulist Press, 1981
Eade, R (1996) 'The Christian Ministry of Church School Headship', *Spectrum*, 28:1, pp.55-67
Egan, Sister Josephine, *Opting Out : Catholic Schools Today*, Leominster, Fowler Wright Books, 1988
Eisner, E *The Enlightened Eye*, New York, Macmillan, 1991
Elwes, T (ed) *Women's Voices: Essays in Contemporary* Theology, London, Marshal Pickering, 1992
Etzioni, A *The Spirit of Community*, London, Fontana, 1995
Evans, J & Ward, L (eds) *The Social and Political Philosophy of Jacques Maritain*, London, Geoffrey Bles, 1956
Evans, J (ed) *Jacques Maritain: The Man and His Achievement*, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1963
Farber, P 'Tongue Tied : On Taking Religion Seriously in School', *Educational Theory*, vol. 45, no. 1, 1995, pp.85-100
Farley, E 'Can church education be theological education?', in *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation*, edited by Jeff Astley, Leslie Francis and Colin Crowder, Leominster, Gracewing, 1996
Feheney, M, (ed) *Education and the Family*, Dublin, Veritas, 1995
Feheny, M, (ed) *From Ideal to Action : The Inner Nature of a Catholic School Today*, Dublin, Veritas, 1998
Ferguson, T *Catholic & American: the political theology of John Courtney Murray*, New York, Sheed & Ward, 1993
Ferrari, J *Recherches Blondeliennes*, Dijon, Editions Universitaires de Dijon, 1994
Finucane, D *Sensus Fidelium* : The Uses of a Concept in the Post-Vatican II Era, Catholic Scholars Press, 1996
Fletcher, G *Loyalty*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993
Flynn M *The Culture of Catholic Schools* Homebush, New South Wales, Australia, St Pauls, 1993
Folscheid, D (ed) *Maurice Blondel : Une dramatique de la modernité*, Paris, Editions Universitaires, 1990
Fortin, E 'Thomas Aquinas & the Reform of Christian Education', *Interpretation*, vol.17, no.1, 1989, pp.3-17
Francis, L & David Lankshear (eds) *Critical Perspectives on Church Schools* , Leominster, Gracewing, 1993
Gadamer, H.G, *Truth and Method*, translated by Joel Weinsheimer & Donald Marshall, Second revised edition, New York, Crossroad, 1989
Gaine, M, 'Roman Catholic Educational Policy', in *Religious Education : Drift or Decision?*, edited by Philip Jebb, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1968
Gallagher, M.P., 'The New Agenda of Unbelief and Faith', in *Religion and Culture in Dialogue*, edited by Dermot Lane, Dublin, The Columba Press, 1993
Gallagher, M.P. *Clashing Symbols*, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1997
Gallagher, S *Hermeneutics & Education*, New York, State University of New York Press, 1992

Garrison, J and Rud, A (eds) *The Educational Conversation*, Albany, New York, State University of New York Press, 1995
Garver, E *Aristotle' Rhetoric : An Art of Character*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1994
Gauthier, P *Newman et Blondel*, Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1988
Gilkey, L *Catholicism Confronts Modernity*, New York, Seabury, 1975
Gleason, P *Contending With Modernity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995
Golby, M 'Communitarianism and Education' (unpublished) in Papers of Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1996, pp.149-155
Grace, G *School Leadership*, London, Falmer Press, 1995
Grace, G 'Realising the Mission : catholic approaches to school effectiveness' in *Effective for Whom? School Effectiveness & the School Improvement Movement*, edited by R. Slee *et al*, London, Falmer Press, 1997
Grace, G 'Is the a sea-change in Catholic Education?' *Education and Ethos*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1998
Grace, G 'Critical Policy Scholarship: Reflections on the Integrity of Knowledge and Research', in *Being Reflexive in Critical Educational and Social Research*, edited by Geoffrey Shacklock and John Smyth, London, Falmer Press, 1998
Grasso, K Bradley, G and Hunt, R (eds) *Catholicism, Liberalism & Communitarianism*, Lanham, Maryland, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1995
Greeley, A *Catholic High Schools and Minority Students*, New Brunswick, N.J, Transaction Press, 1982
Greeley, A 'What Use Are Catholic Schools in America?', *Doctrine and Life*, vol.47, 1997, pp.77-81
Groome, T.H. *Christian Religious Education*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1981
Groome, T.H. *Sharing Faith*, San Francisco, Harper, 1991
Groome, T.H. *Educating For Life*, Allen, Texas, Thomas More Press, 1998
Gruchy, J de *Christianity and Democracy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995
Gula, R *Reason Informed by Faith*, Mahwah, New Jersey, Paulist Press, 1989
Gunter, H, *Rethinking Education*, London, Cassell, 1997
Gunton, C *The One, The Three and The Many*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993
Hager, P 'Relational Realism and Professional Performance', unpublished paper for Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1996, pp.163-170
Haight, R `The Church as Locus of Theology`, *Concilium*, 1994/6, London, SCM, pp.13-22
Haldane, J `Critical Orthodoxy `, *Louvain Studies*, vol. 14, 1989, pp.108-124
Haldane, J `Chesterton`s Philosophy of Education`, *Philosophy*, vol. 65, 1990, pp.65-80
Haldane, J (ed) *Education, Values & Culture*, University of St Andrews, Centre for Philosophy & Public Affairs, 1992
Haldane, J and Carr, D (eds) *Values and Values Education*, University of St Andrews, Centre for Philosophy & Public Affairs, 1993

Haldane, J 'Education: Conserving Tradition', in *An Introduction to Applied Philosophy*, edited by Almond, B Oxford, Blackwell, 1994
Haldane, J (ed) *Education, Values and the State*, University of St Andrews, Centre for Philosophy & Public Affairs, 1994
Haldane, J 'Philosophy & Catholic Education', *The Sower*, April, 1995, pp.30-31
Halstead, J.M *The Case for Muslim Voluntary Aided Schools*, Cambridge, The Islamic Academy, 1986
Halstead, J.M. 'Voluntary Apartheid? Problems of schooling for religious & other minorities in democratic societies', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol.29, no.2, 1995, pp.257-272
Halstead, J.M. ' Should Schools Reinforce Children's Religious Identity?', *Religious Education*, vol. 90, nos3/4, 1995, pp.360-376
Halstead, J.M. & Taylor, M (eds) *Values in Education & Education in Values*, London, Falmer Press, 1996
Hannon, P, *Church, State, Morality & Law*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1992
Hanson, A & R *Reasonable Belief*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1981
Hastings, A *The History of English Christianity 1920 -1990*, London, Burns & Oates, 1986
Hauerwas, S *A Community of Character*, Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1981
Hauerwas, S and Westerhoff, J (eds) *Schooling Christians*, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Eerdmans, 1992
Hauerwas, S *In Good Company : The Church as Polis*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1995
Hay, D 'Morals and religion', in *The Tablet*, 3/2/96, p.132.
Haydon, G 'Conceptions of the Secular in Society, Polity and Schools', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 28, no. 1, 1994, pp.65-75
Haydon, G 'Thick or Thin? The Cognitive Content of Moral Education in a Plural Democracy', *Journal of Moral Education*, vol.24, no.1, 1995, pp.53-64
Haydon, G *Teaching About Values*, London, Cassell, 1997
Hebblethwaite, B *The Adequacy of Christian Ethics*, London, Marshall Morgan and Scott, 1981
Heie, H & Wolfe, D (eds) *The Reality of Christian Learning*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1987
Heslop, R 'The Practical Value of Philosophical Thought for the Ethical Dimension of Educational Leadership', *Educational Administration Quarterly*, vol. 33, no.1, 1997, pp.67-85
Heyd, D (ed) *Toleration : An Elusive Virtue*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1996
Hick, J and Hebblethwaite, B (eds) *Christianity and other Religions*, Glasgow, Collins, 1980
Higgins, 'The significance of postliberalism for religious education', in *Theological Perspectives on Christian Formation*, edited by Astley, Francis and Crowder, 1996
Hill, E *Ministry and Authority in the Catholic Church*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1988

Himes, M & Pope, S (eds) *Finding God in All Things*, New York, Crossroad Herder, 1996
Hogan, P (ed) *Partnership and the Benefits of Learning*, Maynooth, Educational Studies Association of Ireland, 1995
Hogan, P *The Custody and Courtship of Experience: Western Education in Philosophical Perspective*, Dublin, The Columba Press, 1995
Hogan, P 'Identity, Difference and the Epiphanies of Learning', unpublished paper delivered at Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1997, pp.213-223
Hogan, P & Williams, K (eds) *The Future of Religion in Irish Education*, Dublin, Veritas, 1997
Holmes, D and Bickers, B *A Short History of the Catholic Church*, Tunbridge Wells, Burns & Oates, 1983
Holmes, M *Educational Policy for the Pluralist Democracy*, London, Falmer Press, 1992
Holmes, M 'The Place of Religion in Public Education', *Interchange*, vol.24, no.3, 1993, pp.205-224
Hooper, J.L. (ed) *Bridging the Sacred and the Secular: selected writings of John Courtney Murray*, Washington, DC, Georgetown University Press, 1994
Hornsby-Smith, M. 'A Sociological Case for Catholic Schools', *The Month*, October, 1972, pp.298-304
Hornsby-Smith, M *Catholic Education : The Unobtrusive Partner*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1978
Hornsby-Smith, M *Roman Catholics in England*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987
Hornsby-Smith, M *Roman Catholic Beliefs in England: Customary Catholicism & transformations of religious authority* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991
Hornsby-Smith, M, 'Transformations in English Catholicism: Evidence of Secularisation?', in *Religion and Modernization*, edited by Steve Bruce, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992
Hornsby-Smith, M 'The Catholic Church and Education in Britain: From the "Intransigence" of "Closed" Catholicism to the Accommodation Strategy of "Open" Catholicism', in *Catholicism in Britain and France Since 1789*, edited by Frank Tallett and Nicholas Atkin, London, Hambledon Press, 1996
Horton, J (ed) *Liberalism, Multiculturalism & Toleration*, London, Macmillan, 1993
Hostetler, K 'The Scope & Virtue of Educational Tolerance', *Philosophy of Education*, University of Illinois, 1995, pp.456-459
Hügel, F von *The Mystical Element of Religion*, (in two volumes) London, Dent, 1908
Hügel, F. von *Eternal Life*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1913
Hügel, F. von *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, London, J.M. Dent & Sons, 1921
Hügel, F. von *Essays and Addresses*, Second Series, London, J.M. Dent & Sons, 1926
Hügel, F. von *Selected Letters*, London, J.M. Dent & Sons, 1927

Hügel, F. von *Letters from Baron von Hügel to a Niece*, London, J.M. Dent & Sons, 1928
Hügel, F. von *Readings from Friedrich von Hügel*, selected by Alger Thorold, London, J.M. Dent & Sons, 1928
Hügel, F. von *The Reality of God & Religion and Agnosticism*, London, J.M. Dent & Sons, 1931
Hughes, G, 'Shades of the Ghetto', *The Tablet*, 7/10/92, pp.1396-7
Hughson, T, *The Believer as Citizen : J.C. Murray in a New Context*, New York, Paulist, 1993
Hull, J 'The Holy Trinity and the Mission of the Church School', unpublished paper given at International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham, 1996
Hull, J 'A Critique of Christian religionism in Recent British Education', in *Christian Theology & Religious Education*, edited by Jeff Astley and Leslie Francis, London, SPCK, 1996
Hunt, R and Grasso, K (eds) *John Courtney Murray and the American Civil Conversation*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1992
Inglis, F *The Management of Ignorance*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1985
Jackson, T *Discipleship or Pilgrimage? : The Educator's Quest for Philosophy*, New York, State University of New York Press, 1995
Jacobs, R, *The Vocation of the Catholic Educator*, Washington, DC, The National Catholic Educational Association, 1996
Jenkins, H.O. *Getting it Right*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1991
Jirasinghe, D and Lyons, G, *The Competent Head*, London, Falmer, 1996
Johnson, E *She Who Is*, New York, Crossroad, 1992
Johnson, J *Teaching in Catholic Schools*, Maryvale Institute, Archdiocese of Birmingham, 1994
John Paul II (Pope) *Catechesi Tradendae*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1979
John Paul II, (Pope) *Ut Unum Sint*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1995
Jonathan, R 'Liberal Philosophy of Education: a paradigm under strain', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1995, pp.93-107
Jonathan, R 'Education and Moral Development :the role of reason and circumstance', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 3, 1995, pp.333-353
Jonathan, R *Illusory Freedoms: Liberalism, Education and the Market*, special issue of *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 31, no 1, 1997
Jordan, B *The Common Good: Citizenship, Morality & Self-Interest*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1989
Jung, P.B. 'A Roman Catholic Perspective on the Distinctiveness of Christian Ethics', *The Journal of Religious Ethics*, vol.12, no 1, 1984, pp.123-141
Kamen, H *The Rise of Toleration*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1967
Kay, W & Hughes, F 'Christian Light on Education', *Religious Education*, vol.80, no. 1, 1985
Keenan, J 'The Problem with Thomas Aquinas' Concept of Sin', *The Heythrop Journal*, vol. 35, no. 4, 1994, pp.401-420
Kekes, J *The Morality of Pluralism*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1993

Kekes, J *Moral Wisdom and Good Lives*, New York, Cornell University Press, 1995
Kelly, J.J. *Baron Friedrich von Hügel's Philosophy of Religion*, Louvain, Leuven University Press, 1983
Kelly K *New Directions in Moral Theology*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1992
Ker, I & Hill, A (eds) *Newman after a hundred years*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990
Ker, I *John Henry Newman*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990
Ker, I *Newman and the Fullness of Christianity*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1993
Kerlin, M 'Friedrich von Hügel : The Ultramontane as Ecumenist', *Cithara*, XIV, May, 1975, pp.3-17
Kohli, W (ed) *Critical Conversations in Philosophy of Education*, London, Routledge, 1995
Kolakowski, L *Religion*, Glasgow, Fontana, 1982
Konstant, D (ed) *Signposts and Homecomings* , Slough, St Paul Publications, 1981
Kopas, J, *Sacred Identity: Exploring a theology of the person*, New York, Paulist Press, 1994
Kotva, J 'Christian Virtue Ethics and the "Sectarian Temptation"', *The Heythrop Journal*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1994, pp.35-52
Kupperman, J, *Character*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991
Kymlicka, W, *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989
Kymlica, W, *Multicultural Citizenship*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995
Lane, D 'Catholic Education & the school: some theological reflections', in *The Catholic School in Contemporary Society*, Dublin, Conference of Major Religious Superiors, 1991
Lane, D (ed) *Religion, Education and the Constitution*, Dublin, Columba Press, 1992
Lane, D (ed) *Religion and Culture in Dialogue*, Dublin, Columba Press, 1993
Lash, N *Theology on the Way to Emmaus*, London, SCM, 1986
Lash, N *Easter in Ordinary*, London, SCM Press, 1988
Lash, N *The Beginning and the End of 'Religion'*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996
Latourelle, R *Man and His Problems in the Light of Christ*, New York, Alba House, Society of St Paul, 1983
Leahy, M and Laura, R 'Religious "Doctrines" and the Closure of Minds', *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1997, pp.329-343
Leicester, M & Taylor, M (eds), *Ethics, Ethnicity and Education*, London, Kogan Page, 1992
Leonard, E *Creative Tension : The Spiritual Legacy of Friedrich von Hügel*, New York, Fordham University Press, 1997
Lesko, N *Symbolizing Society*, Lewes, The Falmer Press, 1988
Levinson, B review of Neil Postman : *The End of Education* (New York, Knopf, 1996) in *Harvard Educational Review*, vol.66, no.4, 1996, pp.873-878
Little, S *To Set One's Heart : Belief & Teaching in the Church*, Atlanta, John Knox, 1983
Loader, D, *The Inner Principal*, London, Falmer Press, 1997
Loades, A (ed) *Feminist Theology: A Reader*, London, SPCK, 1990

Lobkowicz, N 'Christianity and Culture', *Review of Politics*, vol 53, Spring 1991, pp.373-389
Lonergan, B, *Method in Theology*, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1972
Lonergan, B *Topics in Education, edited* by Robert Doran and Frederick Crowe, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1993
Long, F 'Blondel on the Origin of Philosophy', *Philosophy Today* 33, 1989, pp.21-27
Long, F 'The Blondel-Gilson Correspondence Through Foucault's Mirror', *Philosophy Today*, 35, 1991, pp.351-361
Long, F 'The Postmodern Flavour of Blondel's Method', *International Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 31, no. 1, 1991, pp.15-22
Long, F 'Blondel's Religious Postulate in *Action*', *The Irish Theological Quarterly*, vol.61, no.1, 1995, pp.57-69
Loughran, G 'The Rationale of Catholic Education', *Education & Policy in Northern Ireland*, edited by R.D. Osborne *et al*, Belfast, Policy Research Institute, 1987
Lubac, H de (ed) *Maurice Blondel et Augustin Valensin. Correspondance* (in three volumes), Paris, Aubier, 1957-65
Lubac, H de (ed) *P. Teilhard de Chardin et Maurice Blondel. Correspondance*, translated by William Whitman, New York, Herder and Herder, 1967
Lubac, H de (ed) *Correspondance Blondel-Wehrlé*, (two volumes) Paris, Aubier-Montaigne, 1969
Lubac, H de *Petite catéchèse sur Nature et Grace*, Paris, Fayard, 1980
Lubac, H de *At The Service of the Church*, translated by A.E. Englund, San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1993
Macedo, S 'Multiculturalism for the religious right?', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol.29, no.2, 1995, pp.223-238
Macedo, S 'Liberal Civic Education & Religious Fundamentalism', *Ethics*, vol.105, April, 1995, pp.468-496
MacIntyre, A *After Virtue*, London, Duckworth, 1993
MacIntyre, A *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?*, London, Duckworth, 1988
MacIntyre, A *Three Rival Versions of Moral Enquiry*, London Duckworth, 1990
Macpherson, E, 'Chaos in the Curriculum', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 27, No. 3, 1995, pp.263-279
Macquarrie, J *In Search of Humanity*, London, SCM Press, 1982
Manen, M van *The Tact of Teaching*, London, Ontario, The Althouse Press, 1993
Manno, B 'Catholic School Education : Providing Leadership in the Educational Reform Movement', *Living Light*, vol. 25, no. 1, 1988, pp.7-12
Maritain, J *The Person and the Common Good*, London, Geoffrey Bles, 1948
Maritain, J *Education at the Crossroads, New* Haven, Yale University Press, 1943
Maritain, J 'On some typical aspects of Christian education' in *The Christian Idea of Education*, edited by D. Fuller, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1957
Maritain, J 'Thomist Views on Education', in *Modern Philosophies and Education*, edited by Nelson Henry, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1955
Marquand, D and Seldon, A (eds) *Ideas That Shaped Post-War Britain*, London, Fontana, 1996

Marsden, G, *The Outrageous Idea of Christian Scholarship*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997
Maxwell, N *From Knowledge to Wisdom*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1987
May, L, *The Socially Responsive Self*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1996
McBrien, R, *Catholicism*, two volumes, London Geoffrey Chapman, 1980; 3rd edition, 1994
McBrien, R, 'Before and After Vatican II', *Priests and People*, August-September, 1996,
pp.297-302
McClelland, V.A., '*Sensus Fidelium*: The Developing Concept of Roman Catholic Voluntary Effort in Education in England and Wales, in *Christianity & Educational Provision in International Perspective*, edited by Witold Tulasiewicz & Colin Brock, London, Routledge, 1988
McClelland, V.A (ed), *Christian Education in a Pluralist Society*, London, Routledge, 1988
McClelland, V.A (ed), *The Catholic School and the European Context*, University of Hull, Aspects of Education, vol. 46, 1992
McCool, G (ed) *A Rahner Reader*, London, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1975
McCool, G *Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century: The Quest for a Unitary Method*, New York, Seabury Press, 1977
McCool, G, *From Unity to Pluralism*, New York, Fordham University Press, 1992
McDermott, E, *Distinctive Qualities of the Catholic School*, Washington, DC, National Catholic Educational Association, 1997
McFayden, A, *The Call to Personhood*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1990
McGettrick, B, 'Management and values', in *The Management of educational policy : Scottish perspectives*, edited by W, Humes & M. MacKenzie, London, Longman, 1994
McGhee, M (ed), *Philosophy, Religion and the Spiritual Life*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992
McGrady, A & Williams, K, 'Religious Education and State Policy in Ireland', *Panorama*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1995, pp.116-132
McGrath, J, *Baron Friedrich von Hügel and the Debate on Historical Christianity*, San Francisco, Mellen Research University Press, 1993
McKeown, M, 'The Paradoxes of Catholic Education', *The Furrow*, vol. 23, no. 11, 1982, pp.680-685
McLaughlin, T.H, `"Education for All" and Religious Schools`, *Education for a plural society: philosophical perspectives on the Swann Report*, ed by Haydon, G, University of London Institute of Education, Bedford Way Paper, no.30, 1987
McLaughlin, T.H., *Parental rights in religious upbringing & religious education within a liberal perspective*, PhD thesis, University of London Institute of Education, 1991
McLaughlin, T.H, `Fairness, controversiality and the common school`, *Spectrum*, vol.24, no.2, 1992, pp.105-118

McLaughlin, T.H, `Citizenship, Diversity and Education: a philosophical perspective`, *Journal of Moral Education*, vol.21, no.3, 1992, pp.235-250
McLaughlin, T.H, `The Ethics of Separate Schools`, in *Ethics, Ethnicity and Education*, edited by Leicester, M and Taylor, M, London, Kogan Page, 1992
McLaughlin, T.H, `Mentoring and the Demands of Reflection`, *Collaboration and Transition in Initial Teacher Training*, ed by Wilkin, M and Sankey, D, London, Kogan Page, 1994
McLaughlin, T.H, `The Scope of Parents` Educational Rights`, *Parental Choice in Education*, ed by Halstead, J.M, London, Kogan Page, 1994
McLaughlin, T.H., 'Values, Coherence & the School,' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 24, no. 3, 1994, pp.453-470
McLaughlin, T.H, Carr, D, Haldane, J, Pring, R `Return to the Crossroads`, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. XXXXIII, No. 2, June 1995, pp.162-178
McLaughlin, T.H., 'Liberalism, Education & the Common School', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 2, 1995, pp.239-255
McLaughlin, T.H. O'Keefe, J & O'Keeffe, B (eds), *The Contemporary Catholic School*, London Falmer Press, 1996
McLaughlin, T.H., 'Education of the whole child', in *Education, Spirituality & the Whole Child*, edited by Ron Best, London, Cassell, 1996
McLaughlin, T.H., 'Education, Multiculturalism & the Demands of Recognition', in *Education, the State & the Multicultural Challenge*, edited by Maria Amilburu, Pamplona, Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, 1996
McLean, G (ed) *Philosophy and the Integration of Contemporary Catholic Education*, Washington, The Catholic University of America, 1962
Mendus, S, 'Tolerance and recognition : education in a multicultural society', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 2, 1995, pp.191-201
Miedema, S and de Ruyter, D, 'On determining the limits of denominational schools', *Panorama*, 1996
Milroy, D 'What makes a Catholic School Catholic?', *Priests and People*, August-September, 1996, pp.336-339
Milton, J *Areopagitica & other tracts*, London, Dent, 1907
Mitchell, B *Faith and Criticism*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994
Möhler, J.A. *Unity in the church or the principle of Catholicism*, edited and translated by Peter Erb, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of America Press, 1996
Moore, M.E.M *Teaching from the Heart*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1991
Moore, M.E.M 'Teaching Christian particularity in a pluralistic world', *British Journal of Religious Education*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1995, pp.70-83
Moran, G *A Grammar of Responsibility*, New York, Crossroad, 1996
Moran, G *Showing How : The Act of Teaching*, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, Trinity Press International, 1997
Morgan, J, 'A Defence of Autonomy as an Educational Ideal', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 30, no. 2, 1996, pp.239-252
Morris, A, 'The Academic Performance of Catholic schools', *School Organization*, vol. 14, 1994, pp.81-89

Morris, A, 'The Catholic School Ethos : its effect on post-16 student academic achievement, *Educational Studies*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1995, pp.67-83
Morris, A, 'Same mission, same methods, same results? Academic & religious outcomes from different models of the Catholic school', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, December 1997, pp.378-391
Morris, A 'So Far, So Good: levels of academic achievement in Catholic schools', *Educational Studies*, Vol. 24, no. 1, 1998, pp.83-94
Morris, A 'Catholic and other secondary schools: an analysis', *Educational Research*, vol. 40, no. 2, 1998
Mouw, R and Griffioen, S *Pluralisms & Horizons*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1993
Murgatroyd, S and Morgan, C, *Total Quality Management and the School*, Buckingham , Open University Press, 1993
Murphy, A, *The Implication of Roman Catholic Doctrine for Curriculum in Roman Catholic Schools*, M.Phil thesis, University of Wales at Aberystwyth, 1994
Murray, D *A Special Concern The Philosophy of Education : A Christian Perspective*, Dublin, Veritas, 1991
Murray, J.C. *The Problem of Religious Freedom*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1965
Newman, J.H. *The Idea of a University*, London, Longmans and Green, 1912
Newman, J.H. *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, London, Longmans, Green & Co, 1921, (originally published 1857)
Newman, J.H. *The Development of Christian Doctrine*, London, Sheed and Ward, 1960
Newman, J.H. *University Sermons*, introduced by D.M.McKinnon and J.D Holmes, London, SPCK, 1970
Newman, J.H. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*, introduced by Nicholas Lash, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1979
Nichols, A *From Newman to Congar*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1990
Nichols, A *Byzantine Gospel: Maximus the Confessor in Modern Scholarship*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1993
Nichols, A *Epiphany: A Theological Introduction to Catholicism*, Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 1996
Nichols, K *Voice of the Hidden Waterfall*, Slough, St Paul Publications, 1980
Nichols, K 'Theology and the Dual System', unpublished paper at International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996
Nichols, K *Refracting the Light : Learning the Languages of Faith*, Dublin, Lindisfarne/Veritas, 1997
Nichols, T *That All May Be One : Hierarchy and Participation in the Church*, Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 1997
Nordberg, R 'Curricular Integration in Catholic Education' *Religious Education*, vol. 82, no. 1, 1987, pp.127-142
Norton, D, *Imagination, Understanding, and the Virtue of Liberality*, Lanham, Maryland, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1996
Nouwen, H *Reaching Out*, London, Collins, Fount, 1980
O'Brien, D 'A Catholic Future for Catholic Higher Education?', *Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, vol. 1, no. 1, September 1997, pp.37-50

O'Connell, M, *Critics on Trial*, Washington, DC, Catholic University of America Press, 1994
O'Hear, A 'Values, Education and Culture', in *Education, Values and Culture*, The Victor Cook Memorial Lectures, Centre for Philosophy and Public Affairs, University of St Andrews, 1992
O'Keefe, J and Haney, R (eds) *Conversations in Excellence*, Boston and New York, Boston College/National Catholic Educational Association, 1998
O'Keeffe, B, *Schools for Tomorrow*, London, Falmer Press, 1988
O'Keeffe, B 'Catholic Education in an Open Society: the English Challenge', in *The Catholic School and the European Context, edited* by V.A.McClelland, Hull University, Aspects of Education, Number 46
O'Keeffe, B, 'Fairness - A Missing Theme in Education', *Law & Justice*, no 124/125, 1995, pp.3-16
O'Keeffe, B 'Beacons of Hope', *The Tablet*, 24/4/97, pp.667-8
O'Keeffe, B 'The Changing Role of Catholic Schools in England and Wales: From Exclusiveness to Engagement', in *Leading the Catholic School*, edited by John McMahon, Helga Neidhart & Judith Chapman, Richmond Virginia, Australia, Spectrum Publications, 1997
Oldenski, T *Liberation Theology and Critical Pedagogy in Today's Catholic Schools*, New York, Garland Publishing, 1997
O'Leary, D (ed) *Religious Education and Young Adults*, Slough, St Paul Publications, 1983
O'Neill, M 'Toward a Modern Concept of Permeation', *Momentum*, vol.10, May, 1979, pp.48-50
O'Sullivan, O, *The Silent Schism*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1997
Ozga, J 'Deskilling and Professions: Professionalism, Deprofessionalisation and the new managerialism', in *Managing Teachers as Professionals*, edited by Hugh Busher and Rene Saran, London, Kogan Page, 1995
Pailin, D *A Gentle Touch*, London, SPCK, 1992
Palmer, P *To Know As We Are Known*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1983
Pattison, S 'The Shadow Side of Jesus', *Studies in Christian Ethics*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1995, pp.54-67
Pattison, S, *The Faith of the Managers*, London, Cassell, 1997
Paul, E.F *et al* (eds), *Cultural Pluralism and Moral Knowledge*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994
Paul, E.F. *et al* (eds), *The Communitarian Challenge to Liberalism*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997
Pavlischek, K *John Courtney Murray & the dilemma of religious toleration*, Thomas Jefferson University Press, 1994
Pelikan, J, *The Vindication of Tradition*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1984
Penzenstadler, J 'Meeting Religious Diversity in a Catholic College', *Religious Education*, vol. 91, no. 3, 1996, pp.382-395
Perks, S *The Christian Philosophy of Education Explained*, Whitby, Avant Books, 1992
Peters, R.S., *Ethics and Education*, London, Allen and Unwin, 1966

Peterson, M *Philosophy of Education*, Leicester, Intervarsity Press, 1986
Pius X (Pope), *On the Doctrines of the Modernists (Pascendi Dominici Gregis)* and *Syllabus Condemning the Errors of the Modernists (Lamentabili Sane)*, Boston, St Paul Editions, nd (originally 1907)
Pius XI (Pope), *Divini Illius Magistri/On Christian Education of Youth*, in *Selected Papal Encyclicals and Letters*, vol. 1, 1896-1931, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1939
Pollard, J 'Why We Do What We Do : A Reflection on Catholic Education & Catholic Schools', *Living Light*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1989, pp.103-111
Postman, N *Teaching as a conserving activity*, New York, Dell Publishing, 1979
Postman, N *The End of Education*, New York, Vintage, 1996
Power, F. C and Lapsley (eds) *The Challenge of Pluralism, Education, Politics and Values*, University of Notre Dame Press, 1992
Prangley. J 'Examination factories', *The Tablet*, 15/2/97, pp.207-208
Pring, R, 'Liberal & Vocational Education: A Conflict of Value,' in *Education, Values and the State*, edited by John Haldane, Centre for Philosophy and Public Affairs, University of St Andrews, 1994
Pring, R *Closing the Gap: Liberal education & vocational preparation*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1995
Pring, R, 'Values and Education Policy', in *Values in Education and Education in Values*, edited by Mark Halstead and Monica Taylor, London, Falmer Press, 1996
Pring, R 'Markets, Education and Catholic Schools', in *The Contemporary Catholic School*, edited by Terence McLaughlin, Joseph O'Keefe and Bernadette O'Keeffe, London, Falmer Press, 1996
Pybus, E and McLaughlin, T.H. *Values, Education & Responsibility*, University of St Andrews, 1995
Pyke, N 'The Churches recover their voice', *The Tablet*, 24/5/97, pp.662-4
Pyke, N 'Young minds in trouble' *The Tablet*, 15/2/97, pp.210-211
Quicke, J 'Differentiation: a contested concept', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 25, no. 2, 1995, pp.213-224
Quinton, A 'Culture, Education and Values' in *Education, Values and Culture*, The Victor Cook Memorial Lectures, edited by John Haldane, Centre for Philosophy and Public Affairs, University of St Andrews, 1992
Ranson, S, *Towards the Learning Society*, London, Cassell, 1994
Ranson, S & Stewart, J, *Management for the Public Domain : Enabling the Learning Society*, London, Macmillan, 1994
Raphael, T, *The Role of the Church School in a Multi-faith City*, London, London Diocesan Board for Schools, 1991
Redden, J and Ryan, F, *A Catholic Philosophy of Education*, Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956
Rescher, N *Ethical Idealism*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1987
Riordan, P *A Politics of the Common Good*, Dublin, Institute of Public Administration, 1996
Roberts, R 'Our Graduate Factories' *The Tablet*, 11/10/97, pp.1295-1297

Roebben, B, 'Do we still have faith in young people?', *Religious Education*, vol. 90, 3/4, 1995, pp.327-345
Rohr, R and Martos, J *Why Be Catholic?*, Cincinnati, St Anthony Messenger Press, 1989
Rosenblum, N (ed) *Liberalism and the Moral Life*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1989
Rouner, L (ed) *Selves, People and Persons: what does it mean to be a self?*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press,1992
Rudd, D and Sullivan, E, *Working for Unity*, Diocese of Arundel and Brighton, 1993
Ruddle, P.J., 'The Ecumenical Dimension in the Work of Baron Friedrich von Hügel' *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, vol. 50, Part 4, 1974, pp.231-254
Rudduck, J., Harris, S., Wallace, G., `Coherence ` and Students` Experience of Learning in the Secondary School`, *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol.24, no.2, 1994, pp.197-211
Rummery, R *Catechesis and Religious Education in a Pluralist Society*, Sydney, Dwyer, 1975
Ruyter, D de 'Christian Education in a pluralistic society', paper given at St Edmund's College, Cambridge University 14/12/95
Ruyter, D de and Miedema, S, 'School, identity & the conception of the good. The denominational tradition as an example', *Studies in philosophy and education*, 1996
Ryan, D, *The Catholic Parish*, London, Sheed & Ward, 1996
Sachs, J, *The Christian Vision of Humanity*, Collegeville, Minnesota, Michael Glazier Book, 1991
Sacks, J, *The Persistence of Faith*, London, Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1991
Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Catholic School*, Rome, and London, Catholic Truth Society, 1977
Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *Lay Catholics in Schools : Witnesses to faith*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1982
Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *Educational Guidance in Human Love*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1983
Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Religious Dimension of Education in a Catholic School*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1988
Saint-Jean, R *L'Apologétique philosophique*: Blondel 1893-1913, Paris, 1966
Sandel, M *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982
Sandel, M *Democracy's Discontent*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1996
Sandsmark, S, 'Religion - Icing on the Educational Cake', *Religious Education*, vol. 90, nos3/4, 1995, pp.427-432
Scheffler, I *In Praise of the Cognitive Emotions*, London, Routledge, 1991
Schindler, D, *Heart of the World, Center of the Church*, Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1996
Schmitz, K, *At the Center of the Human Drama: The Philosophical Anthropology of Karol Wojtyla*, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of America Press, 1993

School Curriculum and Assessment Authority, *Consultation on values in education and the community*, London, 1996
Schreiter, R, *The New Catholicity*, New York, Orbis, 1997
Schwobel, C & Gunton, C (eds) *Persons, Divine and Human*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1992
Selbourne, D *The Principle of Duty*, London, Sinclair Stevenson, 1994
Sergiovanni, T, *Moral Leadership*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1992
Sertillanges, A *The Intellectual Life : Its Spirit, Conditions, Methods*, translated by Mary Ryan, Cork, The Mercier Press, 1946
Shorter, A *Toward a Theology of Inculturation*, London, Geoffrey Chapman, 1988
Shortt, J and Cooling, T (eds) *Agenda for Educational Change*, Leicester, Apollos, 1997
Siegel, H, 'What Price Inclusion?', *Teachers College Record*, vol. 97, no. 1, 1995, pp.6-31
Singh, B, 'Shared Values, Particular Values, and Education for a Multicultural Society,' *Educational Review*, vol. 47, no.1, 1995, pp.11-24
Skolimowski, H *Living Philosophy*, London, Arkana, 1992
Smeyers, P 'Education and the educational Project I: the atmosphere of post-modernism', *The Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1995, pp.109-119
Snik, G & Jong, J de 'Liberalism and Denominational Schools', *The Journal of Moral Education*, vol. 24, no. 4, 1995, pp.395-407
Sokolowsi, R *Eucharistic Presence*, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of America Press, 1994
Spiecker, B, 'Commitment to Liberal Education', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, vol. 15, 1996, pp.281-291
Standish, P, 'Postmodernism and the Education of the Whole Person', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 1, 1995, pp.121-135
Stradling, R and Saunders, L *Differentiation: A Practical Handbook of Classroom Strategies*, Coventry, NCET, 1993
Sturzo, L *The True Life*, London, Geoffrey Bles, 1947
Sullivan, F, *Creative Fidelity: Weighing and Interpreting Documents of the Magisterium*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan, 1996
Sullivan, J 'Subjectivity and Religious Understanding', *Theology*, November 1982, pp.410-417
Sullivan, J 'Lonergan, Conversion and Objectivity', *Theology*, September 1983, pp.345-353
Sullivan, J 'Living Tradition', *The Tablet*, 23/1/82, pp.80-81
Sullivan, J 'Living Tradition', *The Downside Review*, vol. 105, January 1988, pp.59-66
Sullivan, J 'Blondel and a Living Tradition for Catholic Education', *Catholic Education : A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, vol. 1, No. 1, September 1997, pp.67-76
Sullivan, J 'Leading Values and Casting Shadows', *Pastoral Care in Education*, vol. 15, no. 3, September 1997, pp.8-12

Sullivan, J 'Leading Values and Casting Shadows in Church Schools', *Education and Ethos*, vol. 1, no. 1, April 1998
Sullivan, J 'Compliance or Complaint: Some Difficulties Regarding Teachers in Catholic Schools', *Irish Educational Studies*, vol. 17, 1998
Sundermeier, M & Churchill, R (eds) *The Literary & Educational Effects of the Thought of John Henry Newman*, Lewiston, New York (and Lampeter, Wales,) The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995
Suttle, B, 'The Need for and Inevitability of Educational Intolerance', *Philosophy of Education*, University of Illinois, 1995, pp.448-455
Tanner, Kathryn *Theories of Culture*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1997
Taylor, C, *Sources of the Self*, Cambridge, Cambridge Univ Press, 1989
Taylor, C, *Multiculturalism*, edited by Amy Gutman, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1994
Thatcher, A 'Making the Difference - Theology of Education and Church Schools', unpublished paper at International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996
Thiessen, E.J., 'A Defense of a Distinctively Christian Curriculum', *Religious Education*, vol. 80, no. 1, 1985, pp.37-50
Thiessen, E.J., *Teaching for Commitment*, Montreal, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993
Thiessen, E.J., 'Liberal Education, Public Schools, & the Embarrassment of Teaching for Commitment', *Philosophy of Education*, University of Illinois, 1995, pp.473-481
Thiessen, E.J., 'Fanaticism and Christian Liberal Education : A Response to Ben Spiecker's "Commitment to Liberal Education"', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, vol. 15, 1996, pp.293-300
Tarrant, J, 'Education and Conceptions of Democracy: a Reply to Bonna Haberman', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 30 no. 2, 1996, pp.289-293
Treston, K, *Transforming Catholic Schools*, Brisbane, Creation Enterprises, 1992
Ungoed-Thomas, J, 'Vision, Values and Virtues', in *Values in Education and Education in Values*, edited by Mark Halstead and Monica Taylor, London, Falmer Press, 1996
Van Manen, M *The Tact of Teaching*, London, Ontario, The Althouse Press, 1993
Vargish, T, *Newman : The Contemplation of Mind*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1970
Veling, T *Living in the Margins*, New York, Crossroad, 1996
Vergioux, A 'Education, Time and Liberty', Papers of Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1995, pp.162-165
Vermes, P, *Buber on God and the Perfect Man*, Scholars Press, 1980
Veverka, F, `The Ambiguity of Catholic Educational Separatism`, *Religious Education*, vol.80, no. 1, 1985, pp.64-100
Volf, M, *Exclusion and Embrace*, Nashville, Abingdon, 1996
Walker, A *Telling the Story*, London, SPCK, 1996
Walsh, M 'The Battle for St Philip's', *The Tablet*, 10/10/92, pp.1261-2
Walsh, M and Davies, B (eds) *Proclaiming Justice and Peace: Documents from John XXIII to John Paul II*, London, Collins Liturgical Publications, 1984
Walsh, P, *Education and Meaning*, London, Cassell, 1993

Walsh, P, 'Education and Celebration', *Spectrum*, vol. 26, no. 2, 1994, pp.105-114
Walsh, P, 'A Jesuit School', paper delivered at International Symposium on Church Schools, Durham University, 1996.
Walzer, M, *Thick and Thin*, Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press, 1994
Walzer, M, 'Education, democratic citizenship and multiculturalism', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 29, no. 2, 1995, pp.181-189
Warnet, M and Klein, J 'The levels of Religious Schooling and Practices of Teachers and their perception of school leadership', *British Journal of Religious Education*, vol. 19, No. 3, 1997, pp.157-163
Watson, B (ed) *Priorities in Religious Education*, London, Falmer Press, 1992
Wells, D *The Supply of Catholic Teachers*, London, Catholic Education Service, 1994
Whelan, J *The Spirituality of Friedrich von Hügel*, London, Collins, 1971
White, J, *Education and the End of Work*, London Cassell, 1997
Whitehead, M, 'The Changing Face of the Catholic Independent Schools', in *Private and Independent Education*, edited by V.A, McClelland, The University of Hull, Aspects of Education series, no 35, 1986
Whyte, G, 'Religion, Education & an Indeterminate Constitution', *Doctrine & Life*, vol. 47, May/June, 1997, pp.274-283
Wilcox, B, 'Schooling, School Improvement & the Relevance of Alasdair MacIntyre', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 27, no. 2, 1997, pp.249-260
Williams, B *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy*, London, Fontana, 1985
Williams, K, 'The Case for Democratic Management in Schools', *Irish Educational Studies*, vol. 8, no. 2, 1989, pp.73-86
Williams, K, 'State Support for Church Schools: Is it justifiable?', *Studies in Education*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1995
Williams, K, 'The Religious Dimension of Secular Learning : an Irish dilemma', *Panorama*, 1996
Williams, K, 'Parents' Rights and the Integrated Curriculum', *Doctrine & Life*, vol. 47 March, 1997, pp.142-150
Williams, K, 'Education & human diversity : The ethics of separate schooling revisited', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. 46, No. 1, March 1998, pp.26-39.
Wilson, K, 'Unnatural Selection', *Education*, 23/2/96, p.12.
Wolf, S, 'Two Levels of Pluralism', *Ethics*, no 102, 1992, pp.785-798
de Wolff, A, 'The Identity of Christian Schools', unpublished paper presented at the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Conference, Oxford, 1997
Young, R, 'Decolonising Education: The Scope of Educational Thought', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, vol. 15, no. 4, 1996, pp.309-322.